

THE  
CHURCH REVIEW.

---

---

VOL. X.

JULY, 1857.

No. 2.

---

---

ART. I.—THE ENGLISH REFORMATION A CATHOLIC WORK.

1. *Whately's Kingdom of Christ.* New York: 1843.
2. *Litton's The Church in its Idea, Attributes, and Ministry.* London: 1851.
3. *Colton's Genius and Mission of the American Episcopal Church.* New York: 1853.
4. *Hildyard's Letter to Lord Palmerston: The People's Call for a Revision of the Liturgy.* London: 1857.
5. *Ira Warren's Cause and Cure of Puseyism.* Boston: 1847.
6. *Wilberforce's Principles of Church Authority.* Baltimore: 1855.
7. *Ives' Trials of a Mind in its Progress to Catholicism.* Boston: 1854.
8. *Shimeall's Romanism of Low Churchism, and End of Prelacy.* New York: 1855.
9. *Noel's Union of Church and State.* New York: 1849.
10. *Coleman's Antiquities of the Christian Church.* Andover: 1841.

WHAT we design to show in the following pages, is, that the English Reformation was conducted on the strictest Catholic principles; or, first, that the Church of England had the right

or power to reform herself; and second, that, in reforming herself, she duly exercised that right.

There are numerous collateral points, which we shall not touch; or at most, only incidentally. Such as, that a Reformation was absolutely demanded by the condition of Morals, Doctrine, and Discipline; and this, by the strongest consentient testimony of numerous antecedent Romish writers for many hundred years; that the Reformation was Scriptural in its character as well as Catholic; that there were agents and agencies Providentially employed in bringing about the Reformation, for which the Church is not to be held responsible—these, and numerous similar questions, we shall pass by. Our business now, is, to show, not so much what was done, as that the Church had the right to act in the work of Reformation; and then, that she did not transcend the limits of that right.

Neither does it pertain at all to our present enquiry, who it was, that first established the Church in England. Nor would it affect the question before us, even if it could be shown, that Romish Missionaries first planted the cross in England; and that a willing allegiance had been paid to the Church of Rome down to the period of the Reformation. And yet, in fact, the Church was established in England in the very first age of Christianity; probably, by Joseph of Arimathea; or, by St. Paul the Apostle; or by both; but, indisputably, hundreds of years before Augustine landed on her shores. Her Rites and Ceremonies all showed an Eastern instead of a Western origin; and, we have before us the long and well attested history of protest and remonstrance, with which, step by step, the English Church met the progress of Romish usurpation. In fact, Rome, in her grasping ambition, was the tyrannical usurper over, not the founder of, the English Church. But, as we said, the *origin* of the English Church has really nothing to do with the merits of the question now before us; though we shall glance at that origin in the course of the discussion.

It was, and is, a Catholic principle, that, as all the Twelve Apostles were equal in Mission, equal in Commission, equal in Power, equal in Honor, equal in all things, except in priority of Order, (St. James presided in the first Council of the Apostles,) so the Bishops, as successors of the Apostles in the Ministry and Government of the Church, are all equal in the above respects; there being but one Episcopacy, whereof each and every Bishop hath an equal share. This, we say, is a well established Catholic principle. Even the Council of Trent, of which more than one-half or *one hundred and eighty-seven* of its *two hundred and seventy-two*



prelates, were Italians, again and again professed to be guided in its judgments "by the unanimous consent of the Fathers," and the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils, and this, too, while it demanded obedience to Canons, and a belief in novelties opposed to the whole teaching of the Early Church; and then, sought to enforce those novelties by the authority of a packed body which can in no sense be called a General Council. The Church of England, in the Work of Reform, took as its guide that same great Catholic Principle; to wit: HOLY SCRIPTURES AS THE RULE OF FAITH AND ORDER, ACCORDING TO PRIMITIVE CATHOLIC INTERPRETATION. This will appear clearly before we are done.

The first Ecumenical Council at Nice, A. D. 325, consisting of 318 Bishops, was assembled mainly to consider and act upon the Arian Heresy. The case of the Church of Alexandria, however, came up for consideration also; troubled, as it was, by the irregular proceedings of Miletius, Bishop of Lycopolis; and the sixth Canon of that Council commences with the following declaration:

"Let the ancient customs prevail, that are in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria have power over them all, forasmuch also, as the Bishop of Rome hath the like custom. In like manner in Antioch, and all other Provinces, let the privileges be preserved to the Churches."\*

The distinct and perfect independence of each Provincial Church, its power to manage and superintend its own concerns, and the limitation of the power of Rome within its own provincial district, are here broadly and unqualifiedly asserted.

The Second Ecumenical Council was held at Constantinople, in A. D. 381; and was attended by 150 Oriental Bishops; and was assembled mainly to appease the troubles in the East caused by the various Heresies of the Arians, Macedonians, and others. Here the old Catholic principle, of the independence of each Provincial Church to manage its own affairs, and its entire freedom from any subjection whatever to the See of Rome, is again asserted. The Second Canon commences as follows:

"Let not the Bishops go out of their Diocese, (patriarchate,) to Churches beyond their bounds, nor cause a confusion of Churches, but, according to the Canons let the Bishop of Alexandria order the affairs in Egypt only, and the Bishops of the East in the East only, saving the dignity of the Church in Antioch, expressed in the Canons of Nice," &c.†

---

\* Canons of Council of Nice, Can. VI.

† Canons of Council of Cons. Can. II.

The Third Œcumenical Council assembled at Ephesus, A. D. 431; and was attended by 200 Bishops and Fathers. It was called to settle the contentions growing out of the doctrines of Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople. But it appears that the Patriarch of Antioch had challenged to himself the ordination of the Bishops of Cyprus; and, consequently, a patriarchal jurisdiction over them. The case was thoroughly heard and argued; and, at length, sentence was given as follows:

“Since common diseases do need greater remedies, because they bring greater damages, if it be not the ancient custom that the Bishop of Antioch ordain in Cyprus, as the Council is sufficiently satisfied, the Cyprian Prelates shall hold their rights untouched and unviolated according to the Canons of the Holy Fathers, and the ancient custom, ordaining their own Bishops. And let the same be observed in other Dioceses, and in all Provinces; that no Bishop occupy another Province, which formerly, and from the beginning, was not under the power of him or his predecessors. If any do occupy another Province or subject it by force, let him restore it, that the Canons of the Fathers be not slighted, nor pride creep into the Church under the pretext of worldly power; lest, by little and little, that liberty be lost which Christ purchased for us with His Blood. Therefore, it hath pleased the Holy Synod, that every Province enjoy its rights and customs unviolated, which it had from the beginning.\*

The same principle is taught in the Canons, known as the “Canons of the Holy Apostles;” and which, whatever the precise date of their origin, certainly originated at a period, “during a portion of which, at least, heathenism was dominant, the sighing of Christian prisoners was heard, the blood of Martyrs was flowing.” One of those Canons is as follows:

“The Bishops of each Province ought to know who is the chief among them, and to esteem him as their head, and not to do any great thing without his consent; but every one to manage only the affairs that belong to his own Parish, and the places subject to it. But, neither let the chief Bishop do anything without the consent of all; for thus there will be unanimity, and God will be glorified by CHRIST, in the Holy Spirit.”†

And again, “Let a Council of Bishops be held twice in the year; and let them ask one another the doctrines of piety; and let them determine the ecclesiastical disputes that happen;

\* Council of Ephesus, Can. VIII.

† Constitutions and Canons, Book VIII, Ch. XLVII, Can. XXXV.

once in the fourth week of the Pentecost, and again on the twelfth of October.”\*

In the authoritative proceedings of each, and all, of these General Councils, not only is no sort of subordination of other Provincial Churches to the Roman See, recognized; but decisions are pronounced, and are enforced, utterly irreconcilable with any such subordination, expressed or implied.

Now, it is certain, although Sharon Turner and some other English writers have ignored the fact, that for the first six hundred years of the Christian Church, the Bishops of Rome had no sort of connection with, or authority over, the British Churches. And yet, it is equally certain, that during this whole period, the Church did exist in England, and in its completeness. Tertullian, Eusebius, and Origen, all describe the British Church as founded in the very earliest age of Christianity; and Eusebius says it was by the Apostles themselves.† There were three British Metropolitan Bishops at the Gallican Council of Arles, in A. D. 314; viz, Eburius, Bishop of York; Restitutus, Bishop of London; and Adelfius, Bishop of Caerleon; together with a Presbyter and Deacon.‡ Soon after, the number of Provinces was increased to five; and it is believed that by the close of the fourth century, there were *twenty-eight* Episcopal Sees in Britain, and within the five Provinces, not less than *seven hundred* Clergy.§ Nor, as there is reason to believe, and as we might easily show, has the Succession from those old British Bishops ever been lost in the English Church down to the present day. The Saxons, on their invasion of Britain in the middle of the fifth century, burning with the lust of conquest, at once attempted the extermination of the Christians. Gildas, the earliest British historian and the principal authority of Bede, although the editor of Gildas says he does not do justice to the valor of the Britons, has the following: “From the East to the West, nothing was to be seen but Churches burnt and destroyed to their very foundations. The inhabitants were extirpated by the sword, and buried under the ruins of their houses. The altars were daily profaned by the blood of the slain thereon.”|| And Bede says, “The Priests were everywhere slain before the altars; the Bishops and the people, without any respect of persons, were destroyed with fire and sword.”¶

\* Constitutions and Canons, Book VIII, Ch. XLVII, Can. XVIII.

† Tertull. c. Judeos, c. vii; Eus. Præp. Evang. iii, 7; Origen, Hom. in Ezek. IV, in St. Luc. Hom. 6.

‡ Thackeray's Ancient Britain, Vol. I, pp. 275-9.

§ For a list of these twenty-eight Sees, &c. see Thackeray's Ancient Britain, Vol. II, pp. 80-92, and Stillingfleet's Orig. Brit. c. ii.

|| Works of Gildas, sec. 24.

¶ Bede's Ecc. His., B. I, Ch. 15.

Augustine, the Romish missionary, landed in Britain in A. D. 597 with his forty monks, and found the way already prepared by the Christian Queen, Bertha, for a successful effort among the Saxon idolaters. Having been consecrated Archbishop, and received the *pall* from Pope Gregory, he now, according to Papal instructions, determined to reduce the old British Churches to the Papal obedience. These still existed in considerable numbers, having retired to Cornwall and Wales before the Saxon invaders. Assisted by King Ethelbert, Augustine summoned the British Bishops to a Synod on the borders of Herefordshire and Worcestershire, and demanded of them, 1st, To observe the Roman time of keeping Easter; 2nd, To adopt the Roman Baptism and ceremonies; 3d, To join the Roman clergy in converting the Saxons; 4th, To acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Pope. This First Synod was held at a place called Augustine's Oak, about A. D. 601, or, as others say, A. D. 603. These Bishops desired time for consultation, and also for the meeting of another and larger Synod. At this second Synod, seven Bishops were present, and as is said from Hereford, *Llandaff*, St. Patern's, Bangor, Clyd, Worcester, and Morgan; together with several most learned men from their monasteries.\* At length the Synod returned the following answer, by Dinoh, the Venerable Abbot of Bangor.

We give the translation of Aylett Sammes, from the old British or Welsh language: "Be it known and without doubt unto you, that we all are, and every one of us, obedient and subjects to the Church of God, and to the Pope of Rome, and to every godly Christian, to love every one in his degree in perfect charity, and to help every one of them by word and deed to be the children of God; *and other obedience than this I do not know due to him whom you name to be Pope, nor to be the father of fathers to be claimed and to be demanded.* And this obedience we are ready to give, and to pay to him, and to every Christian continually. Besides, we are under the government of the Bishop of Kærleon upon Uske, who is to oversee under God over us, to cause us to keep the way spiritual."†

This decision cost them their lives. It was received with threats of vengeance. The old Anglo-Saxon Chronicle given by Bede, records the saying of Augustine, "If the Welsh will not be at peace with us, they shall perish at the hands of the Saxons." Soon after, King Ethelfrid, in A. D. 607, invaded North Wales with a great army, and cut off the little

\* Bede, *Ecc. His.*, B. II, ch. 11.

† Sammes' *Antiquities of Britain*. Folio, p. 511.

army of the Welsh at Chester; and hearing that a company of Christians were praying for the success of their countrymen, he ordered them to be immediately massacred. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle says, that *two hundred priests* were slain, and that about fifty escaped. The Monastery at Bangor was reduced to ruins; and Bede acknowledges, that "about *twelve hundred* of those that came to pray, are said to have been killed."\*

But what part did Augustine share in this murderous deed? It appears that Bede has been tortured by forgery to screen that Romish usurper from any participation in it; the words, "*quamvis Augustino prius mortuo,*" now found in that author, being wanting, it is said, in the original copies. The learned Bishop Jewell, after carefully examining the ancient authorities, says, "Hereby it appeareth, that this Augustine not only enkindled this cruel war, but, also was alive and present in the army.†" But whatever might have been the truth as to Augustine's guilt or innocence of this wholesale massacre of the old British Christians, the fact itself shows with what spirit they met the claims of the Papal Supremacy; and that is all with which we are now concerned.

The positions, which we have now made good, are sufficient to establish our first point; to wit, that the British Church had a perfect right, ON CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES, to reform herself. She was an original, independent, integral branch of CHRIST'S Church. Founded by Apostles, or Apostolic men, she never held nor could hold other relations to dominant Rome than as to a tyrannical usurper. The decisions and Canons of the three General Councils, already cited, established it as the common Law of Christendom, that "every Province shall enjoy its rights and customs unviolated which it had from the beginning;" and "that no Bishop occupy another Province which formerly, and from the beginning, was not under the power of him or his predecessors. If any do occupy another Province, or subject it by force, let him restore it; that the Canons of the Fathers be not slighted, &c., lest, by little and little, that liberty be lost which CHRIST purchased for us with His Blood."

In the strong, but faithful language of another: "The Church of Britain has never yet been canonically under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. It is true that the yoke of the Roman pall has been imposed on the shoulders of her Archbishops, and Romish legates have insolently lorded it over God's heritage in our land. True it is, that the 'smoke

\* Bede's Ecc. His., Book II, Ch. 2.

† Defense of Apology. Part V., p. 498. See also, Sammes' Ant. of Brit., p. 511; Bramhall's Works, p. 84; Sir H. Spelman's Br. Councils, p. 111, App. ii; and Timpson's Br. Eccl. History, p. 79.

silver' has been wrung from the labor-worn hand of the British peasant. True it is that, with a blasphemous assumption of spiritual dominion, the Pope poured forth his anathemas against our Church, and dared to excommunicate the Christian Sovereign of these realms. But this dominion over the British Church was usurped; was submitted to from necessity, and only tolerated till it became intolerable. I repeat, that the dominion of the Roman pontiff over the Church of Britain was usurped and uncanonical. For no National Synod had granted to him that dominion; nor had any General Council decreed that she should be under his jurisdiction. On the contrary, in direct opposition to, and in the contempt and breach of the Canons of both the General Councils of Nice and Ephesus, he extended his dominion over the provinces of the British Bishops."

The growth of the power of the Roman See; the facilities, amid the civil disruptions of the Empire for the centralization of despotic sway in the hands of him who held the Bishopric of a city whose prestige it long had been to be hailed as Mistress of the World; the gradual uniting of civil and ecclesiastical power in his one person; the stupendous frauds and forgeries on which that proud Prelate at length based his claim to be the temporal, as well as the civil Ruler of the world—a claim never yet withdrawn, but absolutely defended by his obsequious creatures in our own country—all this belongs to a full exposure of the usurpation by the Romish Bishop of the rights of the old British Churches. On this latter point, the forgeries on which the Pope bases his claim to universal temporal power, even *Gosselin*, a late Romish historian, has the following bold and honest language, for which he has been abused, but never refuted: "It was long believed that the Emperor Constantine, to testify his respect for the Holy See, had granted to it forever by a solemn act, 'the city of Rome, with Italy, and all the Provinces of the Empire of the West.' The deed of this pretended donation, which appears to have been published for the first time in the *ninth* century among 'the Spurious Decretals,' was afterwards confidently cited by a great number of authors, and *was even generally regarded as authentic from the tenth to the fifteenth century*. But, after the revival of learning, many critics demonstrated that it was spurious; and, at the present day, it is generally admitted, that the donation of Constantine, both as it appears in the collection of the spurious decretals, and in the *principal Collections of Councils*, is an apocryphal document."\*

\* "Gosselin's Power of the Pope during the Middle Ages." Vol. I, p. 181.



Here we see the workings of a power in its full development, which, already as early as the sixth century, had fastened its evil eye on the old churches in Britain. Yet in the days of the Saxons, that power continued to be more nominal than real. As Blackstone says, under the Anglo-Saxon dynasties the island was comparatively independent; and was more in *communion* with, than *subjection* to, the Italian pontiff. But the Norman line of monarchs, after William the Conqueror, submitted to the dictation of the Popes, and conceded one point after another, until the nation found itself completely under the foot of a foreign bishop.\*

And yet, neither did the British nation or Church submit quietly to this foreign domination and tyranny. Protest after protest, and remonstrance after remonstrance, were sent to the Pope of Rome; who only returned back anathemas and chains, instead of justice and mercy. Henry I, A. D. 1100, forbade all appeals to Rome, as a thing "unheard of in his kingdom, and altogether contrary to its usages." Henry III, (A. D. 1216,) issued an order to seize all persons bringing any bulls or mandates from Rome. And, during his reign, in the year A. D. 1245, *the Lords spiritual and temporal*, and the whole commonwealth of England, unanimously agreed in a complaint to Rome, of which the following is a pregnant passage:—"Unless the king and kingdom be quickly freed from these grievances, we must make a wall of defense or partition for the House of the LORD, and the liberty of the kingdom, which we have hitherto forborne to do, out of our reverent respect of the Apostolic See."†

And Sewell, Archbishop of York, in A. D. 1256, resisted the usurpation of the Pope; and, though excommunicated, the people crowded to his funeral and honored his tomb.

These, and similar facts in abundance, prove that the papal supremacy in England was regarded as a usurpation of the catholic rights and privileges of that Church; that it was never submitted to willingly, and would have been utterly indefensible, on Catholic principles, even if it had been; and this on the old axiom, that "no length of time can make that to be valid and right which was in the beginning and in itself inherently wrong." *Quod ab initio fuit invalidum tractu temporis non convalescit.* Nor should it ever be forgotten that,

\* Blackstone's Comm. B. 4, ch. 8. See also, for the encroachments of Popery in England, Bramhall's Works, Tom. I, Dis. IV, p. 317. And for the comparative purity of the Anglo-Saxon Church, see Garbett's Bampton Lectures, Vol. II, pp. 231-3; and Soames' Bampton Lectures, pp. 406, 412.

† Math., Paris, An. 1246.



when, at length, a rival and schismatic Church was organized in England, it was done by the Pope himself; but not until the twelfth year of Elizabeth, and not until the Reformation was fairly and canonically established. The responsibility of the schism rests, therefore, with Rome herself.\*

We come now to the English Reformation itself. And here, we are met at once, by Papist and Puritan alike, that the English Reformation was inaugurated and principally brought about by the instrumentality of the sacrilegious and lascivious Henry VIII; who only aimed, by means of it, to subserve his own personal and corrupt purposes; and so made himself, instead of the Pope, spiritual head of the Church of England. To this we have two things to say. First, it is not true. Second, there was no further interposition of the civil power in breaking the shackles of Romish domination, and restoring the Church of England to her primitive and apostolic freedom and purity, than was authorized by the most abundant Romish precedent, previous to the Reformation; and no more than has been claimed and justified by both Papal and Puritan authorities since. In our own country there has been since the Revolution, such complete sundering of all connection between Church and State, that this portion of the history of the mother Church can hardly be duly appreciated. But, it should not be forgotten, that, in all Christendom, for nearly fourteen hundred years, there has scarcely been a parallel to the condition in which the institutions of Christianity now exist among ourselves. And, this state of things was established here at the first from necessity, and not from choice.

Henry VIII was active in giving an impulse to the English Reformation; and yet, even Bossuet himself admits that God has made use of very evil princes to accomplish great works.† That English king did exercise a power of Convocating and proroguing Ecclesiastical Synods; Confirming Synods; reforming the Church by Synods; and suppressing novel innovations by ancient canons. We acknowledge that the clergy did so far submit to the King, as to agree that "all Convocations had been, and ought to be assembled by the King's writ, and promised, *in verbo sacerdotii*, never for the future to enact any new Canons in their Convocations without the King's license."‡ This was submission to the civil power to an extent not required by authority of any General Council; although it was not regarded, then or subsequently,

\* See Gladstone's *State and Church*, Vol. II, p. 167.

† *Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, liv. vii, 49.

‡ Act 25, Hen. VIII, c. 19.

as we shall show by and by, as interfering with her freedom. Still it was not necessary for her efficiency or safety ; for the Church never flourished more vigorously than in the very teeth, and in bold defiance, of the powers of this world. Nor, should we much dislike to see the English Church come to an open issue, if need be, with the State at the present day, on a point like this. By the constitution of the Catholic Church every Bishop has the right to convene his Clergy in a Diocesan Synod ; and every Archbishop, his Bishops and Clergy in a Provincial Council ; and although these powers have been held in abeyance since the time of Henry I, when Convocations became the Ecclesiastical Parliament of the Kingdom, and are still formally convened with every meeting of Parliament, yet the ancient rights of the Church still belong to her, and may be resumed at pleasure.\*

But then, it should also be remembered, that German, Spanish, and French Emperors have exercised the same prerogatives, and to a still greater degree ; and Popes themselves have, again and again, been privy to, and have formally sanctioned such interference. Charles the Great called the Council of Frankford, consisting of 300 Bishops, and in the records of the doings of that Council, the Emperor's language is : " By the Council of our Bishops and Nobles, we have ordained Bishops throughout the cities, and do agree to assemble a Synod every year, that in our presence the Canonical decrees and laws of the Church may be restored."

Henry IV called a German synod at *Wormes* ; and another, of Germans and Italians, at *Brixia*, wherein sentence of deprivation was given against Pope Gregory the Seventh.

So also Frederick the First called a Council at *Papia*, to settle the right succession of the Papacy, wherein Roland the Cardinal was rejected, and Victor declared lawful Bishop of Rome. And the words of the Emperor of that Council were as follows ; and with those words, we might well leave this part of the argument : " Although I know that by virtue of our office and imperial dignity, the power of calling Councils rests in us, especially in so great dangers of the Church ; for, both *Constantine*, and *Theodosius*, and *Justinian*, and of fresh memory, *Charles the Great*, and *Otho*, Emperors, are recorded to have done this ; yet I do commit the authority of determining this great and high business to your wisdom and power," that is, to the Bishops there assembled.†

\* See Massingberd's Eng. Refor., Ch. XII ; Grant's English Church and Sects, Vol. I, p. 285 ; Palmer on the Church, Vol. II, p. 329.

† Bramhall's Works, Tom. I, Dis. II, p. 104.

So also, in France, the French Kings have again and again, "with their Princes, their Peers, their Parliaments, their Embassadors, their Schools and Universities, in all ages, affronted and curbed the Roman Court, and reduced them to a right temper and constitution as often as they deviated from the Canons of the Fathers, and encroached upon the liberties of the Gallican Church."\*

The *principle* then, of civil interference in Church government, is one which the Papists have no right to fault. And as to the Puritans, they have never objected to clothing Civil Rulers with Ecclesiastical power, when their own ends were to be subserved by it. The "Westminster Confession of Faith," (Presbyterian,) declares, that the Temporal Prince "hath authority, and it is his duty to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church; that the Truth of God be kept pure and entire; that all blasphemies and Heresies be suppressed; all corruptions and abuses in Worship and discipline prevented or reformed; and all the Ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God."†

And the Puritans, in this country, as well as in England, taught and acted upon the same principle. Thus the famous JOHN COTTON, whose biographer says of him, "such was his influence in establishing the order of the churches, and so extensive was his usefulness, that he has been styled the Patriarch of New England;" published in A. D. 1644, his famous "THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN." What then does this Puritan "Patriarch" say of the power of the Civil Magistrate in Church matters? In enumerating the list of things which belong to him, he mentions: "The establishment of pure Religion, in Doctrine, Worship, and Government, according to the Word of God; as also the Reformation of all corruptions in any of these." And he teaches how to enforce this Puritan religion too; to wit: "by civil punishments upon the willful opposers, and disturbers of the same. . . . So Josiah put to death the idolatrous Priests of the high places. . . . Nor was that a peculiar duty or privilege of the Kings of Judah. . . . Yea, and of the times of the New Testament, it is prophesied, that, in some cases, capital punishment shall proceed against false prophets, and that by the procurement of their

---

\* Bramhall's Works, p. 109.

† West. Conf., Ch. xxiii.

nearest kindred, &c. &c.”\* There certainly was nothing even charged upon the English Reformation, which would not have been justified by these Puritan authorities. And that the chief Civil Magistrates in the Puritan Colonies of New England regarded their headship of the “churches” as more than nominal, history clearly proves.† The Puritan Synod of 1649, which prepared the “Cambridge Platform of Church Discipline,” was called by the Civil Magistrates; and though it required a Sermon, on “Moses and Aaron kissing each other in the Mount of God,” to remove the scruples of a few, yet the platform itself was reported back to the General Court, and by that Court was accepted and approved.‡

There is still another important fact to be remembered in connection with the position toward the Church conceded to the King. The temporal power of the Pope, and the fact that by at least two Roman Councils, claimed to be Œcumenical, the duty of persecuting “heretics” with fire and sword had become an established doctrine of Popery,§ (persecution has never been made a doctrine of the English Church,) and the fact, too, that this power had not only been claimed, but exercised, without measure or restraint—all these facts seemed to make the connection of the King with the Church an absolute necessity to her protection. That it met that necessity so effectually, sufficiently accounts for the sudden and continued qualms of the consciences of the Papists.

The conclusion of this whole matter, therefore, is, that Henry VIII made no new Law; he only vindicated the ancient liberties of England. There was no power exercised by him, or his successors, in forwarding the English Reformation which had not been exercised repeatedly by the Christian Emperors and Kings of Europe; and which is not abundantly sanctioned by the common usage of all Christendom. Henry VIII, to be sure, bore the title of “Head of the Church;” yet when the question of granting him this title was referred to the Church in Convocation, in A. D. 1531, the Clergy utterly refused any such headship, except on a condition, which condition the King himself accepted. This may be seen in the language in which the title was acknowledged: “*Ecclesiae et cleri Anglicani singularem protectorem et unicum et supremum dominum, et (quantum per Christi legem licet) etiam supremum caput, ipsius*

\* Keys of the Kingdom, &c., pp. 95-7.

† See Cotton Mather's *Magnalia*, Vol. I, Book II, ch. VI.

‡ Mather's *Magnalia*, Vol. II, pp. 181-3.

§ See Concil. Later. III, Can. 27; and Concil. Later. IV, Can. 3, Labb. Concil., Vol. X, p. 1522; and Vol. XI, pp. 147-51.

majestatem recognoscimus." That is, the Church acknowledged the King as head of the Church, so far, and only "*so far as is allowable by the Law of Christ.*" Besides, Queen Elizabeth would not allow herself to be called "Head of the Church;" and took Order in her First Parliament to have it left out of her title. Neither did James I, or Charles I, allow themselves thus to be called; and yet a Political Headship of the Church was granted to the Kings of Israel and Judah, to Christian Emperors, to English Kings, before the Reformation, and even before the Conquest. It is therefore without the shadow of a reason, that Papists and Puritans, alike, harp perpetually upon this agency of Henry VIII, and for the purpose, doubtless, of diverting attention from the real principles on which the English Reformation was conducted. We may sum up this statement in the words of Bramhall:

"Whatsoever power our Laws did divest the Pope of, they invested the King with it. But they never invested the King with any *spiritual* power or jurisdiction. Witness the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth. Witness the public Articles of our Church. Witness the professions of King James. Witness all our Statutes themselves, wherein all the parts of Papal power are enumerated which are taken away—his encroachments; his usurpations; his oaths; his collations; provisions, pensions, Tenths, first-fruits, reservations, Palls, Unions, Commendams, exemptions, dispensations of all kinds, confirmations, licenses, faculties, suspensions, appeals, and God knoweth how many pecuniary artifices more. But of them all there is not one that concerneth jurisdiction purely spiritual, or which is an essential right of the power of the Keys. They are all branches of the external regiment of the Church."\*

Queen Elizabeth, in A. D. 1569, issued a proclamation as follows. That she "claimed no other ecclesiastical authority than had been due to her predecessors; that she pretended no right to define Articles of Faith, to change ancient ceremonies formerly adopted by the Catholic and Apostolic Church, or to minister the Word, or the Sacraments of God. But that she conceived it her duty to take care that all estates under her rule should live in the faith and obedience of the Christian Religion, to see all laws ordained for that end duly observed, and to provide that the Church be governed and taught by Archbishops, Bishops and Ministers."<sup>†</sup>

And James I, in the Declaration prefixed to the Articles,

\* Bramhall's Works, Tom. I, p. 340.

† Lingard, Vol. V, p. 295. Gladstone's State and Church, Vol. II, p. 24-5.

clearly states the relative position of the State and Church in the work of Reformation, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: "That we are supreme Governor of the Church of England; and that if any difference arise about the external policy, concerning the injunctions, canons, and other constitutions whatsoever thereto belonging, the Clergy in their Convocation is to order and settle them, having first obtained leave under our broad seal so to do: providing, that none be made contrary to the laws and customs of the land."

"That out of our princely care, that the Churchmen may do the work which is proper unto them, *the Bishops and Clergy, from time to time in Convocation*, upon their humble desire, shall have license under our broad seal to deliberate of, and to do, all such things as, being made plain by them, and assented unto by us, shall concern the settled continuance of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England now established; from which we will not endure any varying or departing in the least degree."

These full disclaimers of spiritual functions, and these explicit statements, from the Sovereigns of England, of what they regarded as the rightful prerogatives of the Church of England, are sufficient for our purpose. They show that the English Church had, and was regarded as having, the rightful power to reform herself. For both by the authority of General Councils, and by immemorial usage of the Catholic Church, Provincial and National Councils have the right of condemning Heresies and Errors, and correcting abuses. Paul of Samosata, Photinus, Sabellius, Arius, Apollinaris, the Donatists, Pelagians, &c., were all first condemned by particular Councils; and such Councils, at Arles, Carthage, Toledo, &c., made judgments in controversies of Faith. And from first to last, the Church of England, in reforming herself, stood ready to appeal, and did appeal to the judgment of the Catholic Church in all ages, in defense of what she had done. The old rule, "QUOD SEMPER, QUOD UBIQUE, QUOD AB OMNIBUS, TRADITUM EST," was the rule by which she was guided. And no General Council of the Church ever has declared, or ever will declare, that she violated that rule in the work which she thus accomplished.

Nor did the English Church enter upon this work without the full consciousness of what she was doing, and a full sense of the responsibility of her position. For in those Canons in which she finally set the seal of her authority on what she had done, she declared, in the Canon entitled "A National Synod the Church representative," "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm,



that the Sacred Synod of this Nation, in the name of Christ and by the King's authority assembled, is not the true Church of England by representation, let him be excommunicated, and not restored until he repent, and publicly revoke that his wicked error."\*

The English Reformation was a slow work. It was a progressive work. With the Revival of Learning, and the turning of attention on the part of scholars from Scholastic Theology to the original Scriptures, the seeds of Reform had long been germinating, all over Europe, in a deep, rich soil, and were sure, sooner or later, to shoot forth and to bear fruit. Come under what circumstances it might, the event itself, was inevitable; and all central and northern Europe proved its preparedness for such a development. From the accession of Henry VIII, in A. D. 1509, who furnished the occasion for striking the first effective blow, to the final completion of the English Prayer Book, under Charles II, in A. D. 1661, was a period of a century and a half. The Reformation was retarded at the first by Henry VIII, who discovered, at length, that there was a breadth and depth to the movement which he had not measured; a spirit and power in it which looked beyond his ambition as the end in view. And the Reformation was in constant danger, ere it was fully matured, of being precipitated unduly, by the self-will, the private whims and fancies of men who had been brought under the influence of the Continental Reformers. But the Church preserved her continuity and her integrity. She restored the Ancient Faith, and Worship, and Discipline. She became, what she was not before, thoroughly and truly Catholic. And she deserves to-day the tribute which Dryden paid in his time:

"Her front erect with majesty she bore,  
The crosier wielded and the mitre wore,  
Her upper part of decent discipline  
Showed affectation of an ancient line;  
And Fathers, Councils, Church, and Church's head,  
Were, on her reverend phylacteries read."†

It is remarkable, and we doubt not it was specially providential, that the period of greatest activity of Convocation, and when that organic power, and representative of the Church of England was most vigorous and untrammelled, was that very period when the glorious work of Reformation was placed in its hands. It extended from the reign of

---

\* Canon CXXXIX.

† Hind and Panther, Part I.



Henry VI, A. D. 1422, down to the time of Charles II, a period of more than two hundred years. Convocation became a living body, just as Wycliffe, with all his errors "the morning star of the Reformation," rose upon the world; and, though at the bidding of Pope Martin V, it violated his grave and dug up and burnt his bones, and cast his ashes into the River, it lived to make full atonement for all its sins. In the work of Reform, the ordinary course of procedure was, that the work of discussion, preparation, and determination of all matters strictly spiritual and ecclesiastical, was done by the Church in Convocation; and it was then left to the civil power to ratify, publish, and confirm. And, though in the next century and a half, amid the strifes of civil and religious discord, there were occasional instances of irregularity of procedure, there was nothing to mar the harmony, or weaken the authority, of the work which the Church was called to do.\*

To the doings of the Church herself, let us now turn.

*First.* The first effective blow struck in the Reformation by the Church, was the abolishing of the Pope's Supremacy. As the Records of Convocation have been burnt, we are obliged to rely upon other monuments of Convocation; of which, however, there is no scarcity. In A. D. 1534, the question being proposed to the Bishops and Clergy in the Provincial Synods of Canterbury and York, "whether the Bishop of Rome has, in the Word of God, any greater jurisdiction than any other foreign Bishop?" it was determined in the negative. The Universities, Chapters, &c., also throughout the kingdom, declared their assent. With one solitary Bishop (Fisher) alone excepted, this was declared to be the solemn decision of the whole Church of England.

In accordance with this decision of Convocation, Parliament, as early as 1534, unanimously passed an Act abolishing the Pope's power in the kingdom, and prohibiting those multi-form pecuniary exactions by which the coffers of the Pope had been so long and copiously replenished.

*Second.* The next great step in the Reformation, was a motion, made in Convocation, that there should be a Translation of the Bible in English; to be set up in all the Churches of England. This was in A. D. 1536; which, after a long debate, passed both Houses of Convocation. A Petition to this effect was sent to the King, who ordered the work to be done immediately; and three years subsequently, having been begun at Paris, the printing was completed at London. This was usually

\* See Gladstone's *State and Church*, Vol. II, p. 26.

called Cranmer's, and sometimes Matthew's Bible. Thus the necessity of relying on Wickliff's and Tindall's Translations was obviated, and the Word of God, in itself the strongest antidote to Popery, was made accessible to the mass of the people. This was placing the Reformation on solid and reliable ground; and in A. D. 1540 the Bible was set up in all the Churches of England.

It was at this period, A. D. 1542, that the First Book of Homilies was published. For Bonner, Bishop of London, having forbidden the Clergy to allow any one to preach in his Diocese without a license from himself or the King, a set of Homilies was set forth by the Archbishop, which obviated the evil of a want of Preachers; while, at the same time, the minds of the people in those turbulent scenes were quieted and directed. Of that First Book, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hopkins, and Becon, were unquestionably the authors. Of the Second Book, Archbishop Parker, in 1563, speaks of them as being "revised and finished, with a Second Part, by him and the other Bishops."\*

But whoever were their several authors, they were authoritatively set forth by the Church, both in A. D. 1552, in the XXXIV of the XLII Articles of Edward VI; and in A. D. 1562, in the XXXV of the XXXIX Articles of Queen Elizabeth. Their influence in moulding and strengthening public sentiment, and in guarding against the insidious reasonings of Popery was incalculable.

*Third.* The next step in the Reformation was the publication of the Articles of Religion; known as "The English Articles of 1536." In 1536, June 23, the Lower House of Convocation sent to the Upper sixty-seven Opinions, Abuses, Errors, &c., which needed reformation; and the "Articles of Religion" were at length agreed to, being signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and seventeen other Bishops, by forty Abbots and Priors, and by fifty Arch-deacons and Proctors of the Lower House of Convocation. The First of those Articles is as follows.

"All Bishops and preachers must instruct the people to believe the whole Bible, and the Three Creeds, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian; and interpret all things according to them, and in the very same words; and condemn all Heresies, contrary to them, and particularly those condemned by the first Four General Councils."

The Catholic tone and temper of those men, and of the work

---

\* Strype's Parker, I, 253.

which they were about, may be fairly judged by this Article; and the main design of the whole, evidently was, to hold in check the old heresies of the Lollards, which were now revived by the Anabaptists and others.\*

*Fourth.* In 1537, and 1543, Convocation set forth two Formularies of Doctrine, "The Institution of a Christian Man," and "The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition;" (both lately republished in England.) In these, Convocation disclaimed and rejected many of the superstitious rites and ceremonies of Romanism; as the Doctrine of Indulgences; the Worship of Images; the Doctrine of Purgatory; and the Invocation of Saints was greatly guarded and restricted, though not as yet formally forbidden. A still greater advance was made, in a primary movement towards a PRAYER BOOK, for the people in their own language; as the "Necessary Doctrine" &c., contained a translation of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. And, to anticipate a little, in A. D. 1545, the King's PRIMER was set forth, which contained, in addition to the above, the Venite, the Te Deum, the Litany, and sundry Hymns and Collects; all which were commanded to be "taught, learned and read, and none other to be used," throughout the King's dominions.

The next step in the Reformation, was a step backward. It was the enactment by Parliament, in A. D. 1539, of the Six Articles of Henry VIII, reâffirming certain Romish errors and superstitions; and the attempt, though futile, in Convocation, to prevent the circulation of the Bible, now nearly ready, in the common language; but these, as they fall not within our present design, we pass by. They only show the vigor with which the Popish party, with Gardiner at their head, plied their arts to stay the progress of a work which they thoroughly hated. For the denial either of Transubstantiation, or Auricular Confession, or the Celibacy of the Clergy, was to be punished with burning or hanging, at the pleasure of the Court.

We have now noticed the work of Reform, in the Church, and by the Church, down to the time of the death of Henry VIII, Jan. 27, 1547. The writings of the prime movers in those important events show, clearly enough, that those noble old English Reformers examined carefully every step of their way. Cranmer, as Archbishop Parker tells us, had "unrolled the most Ancient Fathers, both Greek and Latin; he investigated all the Councils, and every part of antiquity up to the

\* See Hardwick's History of the Articles of Religion. Phila. 1852. p. 50.

very times of the Apostles." Henry VIII sinks into insignificance before us, as an agent and actor, in the work of reform, when we come fairly in contact with the solid learning and intellectual and moral power of those old Bishops, and see the heroic intrepidity, and masterly skill with which they exposed not only the *απιστον ἑσθλος*, of the Papacy, but the tissue of novelties, superstitions, and corruptions, with which Rome had overlaid the Apostolic Faith and Order of the Church.

The accession to the throne of Edward VI, A. D. 1547, gave a new impulse to the Reformation, though opposed, at every point, by Gardiner, Bonner, and Tonsal, and at their instigation, not less, by the Princess Mary. But God had raised up, in the Primate of all England, a man equal to the occasion; and to him we are principally indebted for the sobriety of the work now so well begun, and for its accordance with pure and primitive models. The great steps in Reform under this Reign were, the preparation, and adoption, of what was known as the First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI, and the XLII Articles of A. D. 1552.

*Fifth.* In the first year of the Reign of Edward, *Convocation having unanimously approved of the measure*, an Act of Parliament was passed, (Dec. 1547,) converting the Mass into a Communion; and requiring that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be delivered to the people under both kinds. A Commission having been issued for this purpose, Cranmer and the other divines prepared an Office for the Holy Communion, which was completed March 8th, A. D. 1548, and which was forthwith published, and its use enjoined by authority.

*Sixth.* A new Commission was issued to the same Commissioners to prepare a complete collection of Divine Offices for Public Worship. This Commission met at Windsor, May, A. D. 1548, and prepared a BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. *It was formally approved by Convocation.* It was ratified by an Act of Parliament, in Jan. 1549, and its use enjoined from the Festival of Whit Sunday of that same year. In this "First Prayer Book of Edward VI," the old Prayers, hallowed by the pious use of centuries, were translated from Latin into English; while Romish novelties and superstitions were rejected. We have no room here to show how far this First Prayer Book differed from the Roman Breviary and Missal in previous use. But the order of the Services was better arranged; while the Ave Maria was omitted; Scripture Lessons were substituted for legends and stories; and the Invocations of the Virgin Mary, and of individual saints and angels, were struck out. But

the Collects of the Ancient Church were closely followed so far as they were Scriptural and Catholic.\* This Book of Common Prayer was set forth by the common agreement and full assent both of Parliament and the Convocations of Canterbury and York. The Committee who prepared this Book were thirteen in number; Archbishop Cranmer; Thomas Goodrich, Bishop of Ely; Henry Holbech, Bishop of Lincoln; George Day, Bishop of Chichester; John Skip, Bishop of Hereford; Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster; Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of Rochester; William May, Dean of St. Paul's, London; Simon Heynes, Dean of Exeter; John Redmayne, Prebendary of Westminster; Richard Cox, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford; and Thomas Robertson, Archdeacon of Leicester.

*Seventh.* In the Convocation of A. D. 1550, the question of a further revision of the Prayer Book was entertained. As the Prayer Book contained no Form for consecrating and ordaining Bishops, Priests and Deacons, an Office for that purpose was drawn up, was confirmed by Act of Parliament, and was published in March, A. D. 1550. The Commissioners also revised the whole Book of Common Prayer; which was completed in the year 1551, and was finally set forth by Parliament, A. D. 1552, April 14th. Parliament declared that the alterations made in it proceeded from curiosity, rather than any worthy cause. It was ordered to be used throughout the kingdom from the Feast of All Saints following. This is known as the "Second Prayer Book of Edward VI." It was also formally received, approved, and adopted by the Convocation at London, in 1552, in the Thirty-fifth Article; and *was subsequently, with slight alterations, adopted unanimously by both Houses of Convocation, of both Provinces, Dec. 20th, A. D. 1661, as we shall hereafter notice.*

The alterations in this Second Prayer Book were, principally, as follows. The Sentences, Exhortations, Confession, and Absolution, were added to the beginning of Morning and Evening Service; the use of oil in Baptism, the Unction of the sick, and Prayers for souls departed, were omitted; the Prayer of Oblation in the Communion Office, and the Rubric ordering wine to be mixed with water were also now left out. The Rubric on the Absolution in the Visitation of the sick was also omitted; and in the Exhortation to the Communion, an expression on the Nature of Absolution was altered.

*Eighth.* The next important step in the Reformation, was

---

\* See Maskell's *Monumenta Ritualia Eccl. Ang.*

the setting forth of the "XLII ARTICLES OF 1552." The *special* origin, or causes for the setting forth of these Articles, it is not necessary here to consider. They were well described in the copy first printed by Richard Grafton; "for to roote out the discord of opinions, and stablish the agreement of trew religion."\* It appears that these Forty-two Articles were drawn up originally by Cranmer; were submitted to the most careful and learned inspection; and that for eighteen months they underwent repeated revisions. For, the King in his letter to Ridley, says, they had been "devised and gathered with great study, and by counsel and good advice of the greatest learned part of our Bishops of this realm, and sundry others of our clergy."† That they were formally submitted to and adopted by Convocation in A. D. 1552, (as they certainly were, "by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces in A. D. 1662,") is evident from several other considerations, as well as from their Title: "Articles agreed on by the Bishops and other learned men in the Synod at London in the year of our Lord God, 1552, for the avoiding of controversy in opinions, and the establishment of a godly concord in certain matters of Religion. Published by the King's Majesty's commandment, in the month of May, 1553."‡

These Articles of 1552, solemnly and formally adopted and ratified by the Church, both now and subsequently, contain a clear and authoritative statement of the Doctrines and principles of the English Reformation. They were designed to define Catholic Truth and Order, in distinction from Romish, Anabaptist, and other errors, heresies, and corruptions.. They were not meant as Articles of peace, except so far as they were Articles of Truth. And, by these Articles, adopted and applied as tests subsequently, the work of the English Reformation was consolidated, clearly defined, and made practically effective.

This brings us down to the death of Edward VI, who breathed his last July 6th, 1553. The Catechism of Cranmer, an important contribution, belongs to this portion of history, but does not come within the limits of our present design.

The accession of Mary to the Throne of England in July,

---

\* For a copy of these Articles and a comparison of them with the Thirty-nine Articles, see Burnet's History, Vol. II, Records, p. 209. See also Hardwick's History of the Articles, Ch. V, p. 79.

† Strype, Eccl. Mem. II, p. 421.

‡ That the "Forty-two Articles" were submitted to Convocation, in 1552, though questioned by some, is proved, we think, by Hardwick. See his "History of the Articles," Ch. V.



1553, interrupted the work so well begun. She died Nov. 17, A. D. 1558, after an unhappy reign of a little more than five years; mortified, as for other more personal causes, so also that her murderous cruelties were inefficacious to uproot the true, reformed, Catholic religion. Fourteen Bishops were expelled from their Sees. Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, in all five Bishops, twenty-one clergymen, and hundreds of others, were burnt at the stake. At least nine thousand, Burnet says twelve thousand, clergymen were deprived. An Act of Parliament was passed in Oct., A. D. 1553, suppressing the Liturgy of Edward VI, and repealing the Statutes of the late reign which confirmed the Reformation. Cardinal Pole came over from the Pope to "reconcile" the English nation; and was met by a packed Convocation of Bishops holding usurped Sees, who received papal absolution on their bended knees. *It does not appear, however, that the "Forty-two Articles" were ever formally abolished by this, or any future Convocation under Queen Mary.*

But the whole of these acts and doings was uncatholic, unauthorized, null, and void. For the Sees were filled by Bishops schismatically appointed, and so, having no power to legislate for the Church of England; and even if it had not been so, the whole procedure was in direct violation of the rules and Canons of the Catholic Church in her Early Councils, as we have already seen; and destructive of the rights and privileges of the English Church herself. For, even Provincial and National Synods have no right to trample upon Canons by which the whole Body of the Church is sacredly bound. The sum of this matter then is: 1st, The "Forty-two Articles" were not repealed. 2d, There was no body then in power competent to repeal them. 3d, Their repeal, if attempted, would have been uncanonical.

Elizabeth was proclaimed Queen of England Nov. 17, 1558. She determined to revive Public Worship as it had been celebrated according to the reformed rites of Edward VI. The Questions which she propounded to her Secretary, Sir William Cecil,\* show with what deliberation and caution she proceeded. She called to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, a man admirably fitted to succeed the martyred Cranmer in presiding over the destinies of the Church in that stormy period. Like Cranmer he was thoroughly imbued with a Catholic spirit. Says his biographer, "His great skill in antiquity reached to ecclesiastical matters, as well as historical; where-

---

\* See Burnet, Vol. I, p. 327.



by he became acquainted with the Ancient Liturgies and doctrines of the Christian Church in former times. He utterly disliked, therefore, the public Offices of the present Roman Church, *because they varied so much from the Ancient.*" And in his last Will, he declared: "I profess that I do certainly believe and hold whatsoever the Holy Catholic Church believeth and receiveth in any Articles whatsoever, pertaining to faith, hope and charity, in the whole sacred Scripture."\* Such was the man now called to the helm when ultra Protestantism and Popery both began to bring their forces to bear upon the Reformed Church of England. He was duly consecrated at Lambeth, Dec. 17th, A. D. 1559, as the Canterbury Register shows, by John Scory, Bishop elect of Hereford; William Barlow, Bishop elect of Chichester; Miles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter; and John Hodgkin, Bishop of Bedford.†

An Act of Parliament, passed April 29, 1559, had already enjoined all spiritual persons holding preferments to take the oath of Supremacy under pain of deprivation,—and that oath was now tendered by the Court of High Commission. Out of 9,400 beneficed men in England, only 189 refused to take it,—*a little more than one in fifty.*

*Ninth.* In the latter part of 1558, a Commission of ten persons had been appointed to revise King Edward's Liturgy; and a bill for restoring that Prayer Book, with slight alterations, passed both Houses of Parliament, April 28th, 1559, entitled, "An Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church, and Administration of the Sacraments." The Act was to come into operation on the day of St. John the Baptist, June 24, 1559. The principal alterations in this Prayer Book, from that of the Second of Edward VI, were in joining both forms of the sentences together in administering the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; in restoring the Rubric, requiring that Morning and Evening Prayer should be said in the Chancel, instead of in the Body of the Church, as was allowed at the instigation of Calvin and Bucer in the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI; and in several other similar changes, indicating a determination to resist the Puritan innovations and intermeddlings which had been so strongly felt in the latter part of the reign of King Edward. Queen Elizabeth publicly and formally declared, "that there was no new faith propagated in England; no new Religion set up, but that which

\* Strype's Parker, pp. 530, 500. And Appendix, No. C.

† For a most thorough exposure of the fable of the Nags-Head Ordination, see Bramhall's Works, Tom. I, Disc. V, p. 425.

was commanded by our SAVIOUR, practiced by the Primitive Church, and unanimously approved by the Fathers of the best antiquity." This Prayer Book, adopted by Parliament on the Report of the Commissioners, came up for discussion and adoption in the great Convocation of 1562. The Puritan party was strong in the Church, and such things as kneeling at the Sacrament, the use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, and the continuance of Organs in the Churches, &c., &c., were only saved by a close vote. Relatively toward Rome, the voice of Convocation was unhesitating. And the Prayer Book was formally adopted, Feb. 13th, 1562, by Convocation."\*

This Prayer Book, to conclude its history here, continued unaltered till the first year of James I, A. D. 1603; when, after the conference of Hampton Court, some Forms of Thanksgiving were added at the end of the Litany, and an addition was made to the Catechism concerning the Sacraments.

So the Prayer Book remained until after the Savoy Conference of A. D. 1661, under Charles II, between twelve Bishops and nine assistants on the one side, and the same number of Presbyterians on the other. The names of the Commissioners are as follows. Of Churchmen, there were: Dr. Fruen, Archbishop of York; Dr. Sheldon, Bishop of London; Dr. Cosin, Bishop of Durham; Dr. Warner, Bishop of Rochester; Dr. King, Bishop of Chichester; Dr. Henchman, Bishop of Sarum; Dr. Morley, Bishop of Worcester; Dr. Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln; Dr. Laney, Bishop of Peterborough; Dr. Walton, Bishop of Chester; Dr. Stern, Bishop of Carlisle; Dr. Gauden, Bishop of Exeter. Their assistants, were Dr. Earles, Dean of Westminster; Dr. Heylin; Dr. Hacket; Dr. Barwick; Dr. Gunning; Dr. Pearson; Dr. Pierce; Dr. Sparrow; Mr. Thorndike.

On the part of the Presbyterians, there were, Dr. Reynolds, Bishop of Norwich; Dr. Tuckney; Dr. Conant; Dr. Spurston; Dr. Wallis; Dr. Manton; Mr. Calamy; Mr. Baxter; Mr. Jackson; Mr. Case; Mr. Clark; Mr. Newcomen. Also, their assistants; Dr. Horton; Dr. Jacomb; Mr. Bates; Mr. Rawlinson; Mr. Cooper; Dr. Lightfoot; Dr. Collins; Dr. Woodbridge; Mr. Drake.

This Conference, fruitless as to any plan of Union with the Presbyterians, sufficed to prove at least one thing; that no compromise would silence the demands of a party which had

---

\* See Burnet's Hist. of Ref., Vol. III, p. 302, and Grant's English Church and Sects, Vol. I, p. 420.

not scrupled to imbrue its hands in the blood of a martyred Archbishop, and a martyred King. And this conviction on the part of Churchmen saved the Prayer Book from being further tampered with. Baxter would not allow that the Prayer Book was even capable of amendment; and had the assurance to propose a *new one* of his own composition. The Bishops, however, suggested certain alterations which were subsequently adopted. The terms *Presbyter*, and *Priest*, were used more definitely in the Rubrics. Several Lessons were changed in the Calendar. The Prayers upon particular Occasions were disjoined from the Litany. Prayers for Ember-week, for Parliament, for All conditions of men, and the General Thanksgiving, were added. A Rubric was added for giving personal absolution to the Sick. Several Collects were altered. The Office for Adult Baptism, and the Form of Prayer to be used at sea were also added. *The English Prayer Book, as it now stands, was unanimously adopted, and subscribed, by both Houses of Convocation of both Provinces, Dec. 20th, A. D. 1661.* The English Prayer Book, therefore, was established by the Convocations, or Provincial Synods of the realm. Besides its authority by Act of Parliament, it was the work of the Church herself, acting in the rightful exercise of her own legitimate authority.\*

*Tenth.* Soon after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, another important step in the Reformation was taken by the Church. In the year A. D. 1562, the Articles of 1552 came up for consideration in Convocation. Previous to this, however, "The Eleven Articles of Religion," compiled by, or under the eye of Archbishop Parker, with the sanction of the other metropolitan, and the rest of the English prelates, had been adopted and enforced as a test of doctrine upon the clergy; but as they were never adopted by Convocation we pass them by. In 1562, summons was issued for an assembling of the Convocations of Canterbury and York; which met Jan. 12, A. D. 1563. The object of this meeting was to revise and act upon the XLII Articles of Edward VI. Convocation assembled Jan. 12th, 1563. After a most thorough discussion those Articles were altered, amended, and added to, until at length on the 29th of January they were unanimously subscribed to in the Upper House. These Articles were now XXXIX in number. They were transmitted to the Lower House, where they also passed, it is believed, unanimously; but the actual signatures of *one hundred and six* members attest a very large

---

\* See Wheatly on the Common Prayer, p. 33.

majority of that body. In the year A. D. 1571, on the assembling of Convocation, the XXXIX Articles were brought into the shape which they retain to the present day, and were enforced as a test on every Candidate for Holy Orders. Having, subsequently, passed both Houses of Parliament, they finally received the royal assent, June 29th, 1571, and subscription to them was required on the part of the Clergy.

The history of these Elizabethan Articles; the alterations in them from the former Articles of Edward; the efforts of the Puritan party as Baxter, and Burgess, to effect still more important changes in them; their pointed precision in defining the doctrine of the Church of England as distinguished from the dogmas of the Trentine Council then recently terminated; their moderation and wisdom; and their essential agreement with the true Faith of the Catholic Church—these are points worthy of the most careful attention. Their full meaning can only be known by a most thorough acquaintance with their origin and history; but, to regard them as a set-off against the Liturgy, the Catechism, and the Sacramental Offices, in questions of Doctrine, or, to regard the Articles as belonging to one system of teaching, and the other symbols alluded to, as belonging to another, is a most gross fallacy. They are all in harmony with each other and with the teaching of the Catholic Church. The best compend of the history of the Articles is that to which we have already referred.\* Nor must we fail, in this connection, to mention the immortal work of Hooker; who, at this particular juncture, or turning point, in the progress of the Reformation, demonstrated certain great principles of Church Polity, which, from that day onward, were like a wall of fire to the Reformed Church, on the right hand, and on the left. The power of Puritanism to tamper with the Church then ceased. It could still rail and persecute; it could not corrupt. The reaction cost a King and an Archbishop their lives; but the Church herself, humanly speaking, was safe.

The instances of formal acknowledgment and recognition of the Prayer Book of the Church of England, and of the XXXIX Articles, on the part of the Church, as her System of Worship and her Rule of Christian Doctrine subsequent to the times which we have now considered, we need not examine. Both are specified in the V and XIV Canons of the Church of England, adopted in the Convocation at London, A. D. 1603, and set forth by royal authority in that same year.

We have now applied two tests of Catholicity to the English Reformation. We have shown that on Catholic principles,

\* Hardwick's History of the Articles of Religion. Phila.: Hooker. 1852. 8vo. pp. 366. See also Cardwell's His. of Conf., 266.

the Church of England, as an integral branch or member of the Church of CHRIST, had a perfect right to free herself from the shackles of bondage imposed on her by a usurping foreign Bishop, and to purify herself from unscriptural and uncatholic errors, heresies, superstitions, and corruptions; and then, we have shown, that in a work extending through a period of over one hundred and fifty years, the Reformation was taken up, carried forward, and completed, by the Church herself. It was also ratified and confirmed, at every step, by the civil or temporal power.

We confess, that the Church hampered herself unwisely, under Henry VIII, in consenting to hold, and to legislate in, Convocations, only at the will of the Sovereign, and in obligating herself to elect and consecrate for her Bishops men nominated by the Crown, no matter who or what they be, or incur the pains and penalties of a *præmunire*. Still the Act of Henry VIII,\* and all others relating to the King's ecclesiastical supremacy, are, in the language of Hickes, "to be interpreted in a sense consistent with those other Acts of Parliament, which confirm the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the Church of England; and the form and manner of making, ordaining and consecrating, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. In those Offices, the Sacerdotal Power, as distinct from the civil, is clearly expressed and asserted."† And yet, unquestionably, the Church yielded rights essential to her independence and freedom of action; and should Kings and Queens, instead of proving nursing Fathers and Mothers to the Church, become her tyrants and oppressors, in respect either to Doctrine, Discipline, or Government, then the Church would clearly owe it to herself, and to her Great Head, to break the chains of bondage at any worldly sacrifice. It might prove ruinous to the State, but it would be a glorious triumph for the Church. Supposing, however, as the Church did suppose, a *Christian* Sovereign placed at the helm of State—a Sovereign bound by his coronation Oath, "to maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the protestant *reformed* Religion, established by Law;" and "to preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of this realm, and to the Churches committed to their charge, all such rights, and privileges, as by law do, or shall, appertain unto them, or any of them;" we say, the Church, supposing all this, as she was bound to do, relying upon a fair,

\* 26 Hen. VIII, Cap. 1.

† "Dignity of the Episcopal Order," pp. 235, 236.

and Christian construction of that Coronation Oath on the part of the Sovereign, has not forfeited her spiritual character, nor surrendered anything essential to her spiritual Constitution.\* Only let her beware, lest, by her silence, or acquiescence, she may sanction, or seem to sanction, at any time, the slightest encroachment of worldly power on her birthright. The attempted revival of Convocation at the present time is an auspicious event; it will prove a test of the vital power of the Church as a living Body, and is evidently so regarded by both friends and foes.

There is still another test of the Catholicity of the English Reformation, to be applied. And that is, as it respects the nature, and character, of the things done in themselves. So far as the rupture with Rome is concerned, which is the chief point now under examination, we have already, incidentally, yet really and fully, met that point in the previous portion of our argument. The Canons of the Catholic Church, at the only period in the history of Christendom when such a judgment could be obtained, settle that question unanswerably. Nor can Rome dispute this position, except by begging the whole question. But to go into a careful examination of what was done, to take up the English Liturgy, to note every doctrine of Religion taught in the Articles, to scrutinize everything which the Church has stamped as error, heresy, and superstition, to apply the test of Catholicity to this interior work of reform, is, of course, beyond our power, now. We only say, that a fresh familiarity with the writings of the Reformers has led to a deeper conviction, not only of the truly Catholic nature of their work, but of the treasures of wisdom and learning, of the high order of genius, of the intellectual power, philosophical accuracy, profound scholarship, exalted piety, and chivalric heroism, which were made to subserve that great event in the History of the Universal Church, the ENGLISH REFORMATION. It was the golden age of English Literature—the age of SPENSER, and SHAKESPEARE, and BACON, and HOOKER, and TAYLOR, and CUDWORTH, and HALL, and JEWELL, and CHILLINGWORTH. “In point of real force and originality of genius,” says Lord Jeffrey, “neither the age of Pericles, nor the age of Augustus, nor the times of Leo the Tenth, or of Louis the Fourteenth, can come at all into comparison.” And yet, during this more than a hundred years, the richest resources of learning and genius laid their choicest treasures on the altars of England’s Reformed Church. And

† See Gladstone’s *State and Church*. Vol. II, Ch. VI, Sec. 11, p. 19.



as the result, she is, almost beyond comparison, together with her American daughter, the truest representative now existing of the Church which JESUS CHRIST and His Inspired Apostles established on the earth. The history of the last twenty years teaches us, that the man who sneers at the English Reformation, is, at least, to be pitied as a simpleton, or watched as a knave.

Nay, more. So impregnable is the Reformed Church of England, on this primitive and Catholic basis, that the best Romish Controversialists yield this point; and admit, that Rome *can* be defended only on other grounds; some, sticking for the infidel theory of Development—and some for the equally infidel theory of Authority; but all admitting, that the old Catholic Rule, the “*semper, ubique, ab omnibus*,” is *for* the good old Church of England, and *against* themselves. Thus Brownson, the ablest Romish controversialist in this country, said, not long since: “These [developmentists] not accepting the authority of the Church, *cannot without such theory, get over the difficulties presented to their minds by the Fathers, nor can we, without it, satisfactorily explain those difficulties to them.*” Nor do we hesitate to add, that had this Catholic position of the English Church been clearly defined, and strongly fastened in the minds of certain men who had been originally trained in the ultra-Protestant School of the Church of England, as Newman, and Manning, and Wilberforce, and Faber, they would, we believe, have been saved from the curse of Popery, and would have remained steadfast and loyal defenders of a true Catholicity, which, alas, they never had been taught, which their hearts yearned for, and which they never yet have found. The lamentable issues of the Rationalistic School—a mixed conglomerate of Arnoldism and Bunsenism, now struggling for power in the English Church—are already teaching, and, let the reader mark our words, are hereafter to teach, this same lesson, with a more startling emphasis.

As an appropriate conclusion to this whole examination, we shall adduce a few specimens of the evidence, showing the Catholic tone and temper of the leading English Reformers. Portions of this evidence, such as the strong testimony of Archbishop Parker, we have before cited. The same spirit pervaded the work which we have already traced, as the records themselves everywhere indicate. But a thorough examination of the lives, the writings, and labors, of those men, would develop this feature in their character, to the satisfaction of the most incredulous. It is, we know, customary, with



both Papists and Puritans, to harp upon individual expressions, or upon isolated facts, which may be culled out of the *debris* which have floated down to us from that *transition* period. It is forgotten, that a union, on a Catholic basis, of all the ranks of the reformed, was an object dear to the hearts of the wisest and best men of that age; and was frustrated, in great measure, by the cunning wiles of the Jesuits; who, to this end, turned Puritan, and in disguise, out-puritanized Puritanism itself in urging on the work of schism, and especially in assailing the Catholic features of the English Reformation. This is an important chapter in the history of those stirring times; and, at some future opportunity, we intend to spread it before our readers. Nobody could then determine what shape the Reformation on the Continent would finally assume. In fact, it unhappily settled down upon a different basis from the Reformation in England. The English Reformers were, at times, strongly under this continental influence. And if anybody chooses to torture individual and inconsistent expressions of the English Reformers, under those peculiar and unparalleled circumstances, into an endorsement either of Romish corruptions and usurpations, or of the mongrel schisms and heresies, the mushroom growths of our own times, and so, to Romanize or Puritanize those men, on points of Doctrine, Orders, or Sacraments, we do not hesitate to say that every such attempt is as unjust to them as it is treacherous to the Church. And, even were it not so, individual opinions are one thing, official acts are another thing. The authorized standards of the Church, the very Prayer Book itself, are the only fair guides to the honest and deliberate opinions of those men.

But let us see what their private opinions were. Archbishop Cranmer said: "When they, the Papists, boast of the Faith which has been in the Church these thousand years, we will join them on this point. For that doctrine and usage is to be followed which was in the Church fifteen hundred years past. And we shall prove, that the Order of the Church set out at this present by the Act of Parliament, is the same that was used in the Church fifteen hundred years past."\*

Again, "Lest any man should think that I feign anything of my own head, without any other ground or authority, you shall hear, by God's Grace, as well the errors of the Papists confuted, as the Catholic Truth defended, both by God's Sacred Word, and also by the most old approved authors and Martyrs of Christ's Church."†

---

\* Cranmer's Works, Vol. IV, pp. 2 and 3.

† Ib. Vol. II, p. 313.

Again, "This is the true Catholic Faith, which the Scriptures teacheth, and the Universal Church of Christ hath ever believed from the beginning, until within these four or five hundred years past, that the Bishop of Rome, with the assistance of his papists, hath set up a new faith and belief of their own devising."<sup>\*</sup>

Again, in A. D. 1556, "Touching my doctrine of the Sacrament, and other my doctrine of what kind soever it be, I protest that it was never my mind to write, speak, or understand, anything contrary to the most Holy Word of God, or else against the Holy Catholic Church of Christ; but purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only which I had learned of the Sacred Scripture, and of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ from the beginning; and also, according to the exposition of the most holy and learned Fathers and martyrs of the Church."<sup>†</sup>

Again. In his Speech on General Councils, A. D. 1534, or 1535, he said: "That when all the Fathers agreed in the exposition of any place of Scripture, he acknowledged he looked on that as flowing from the Spirit of God, and it was a most dangerous thing to be wise in our own conceits."<sup>‡</sup>

Thus much for Archbishop Cranmer. We have quoted already Archbishop Parker, under whom, in time of Elizabeth, the Reformation was brought to its effectual completion. He is equally explicit and decided. The public and formal Exposition of Doctrine put forth A. D. 1543, called the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition," and signed by all the Bishops and in behalf of the whole Church of England, declares: "All those things which were taught by the Apostles, and have been by a universal consent of the Church of Christ ever since that time taught continually, and taken always for true, ought to be received, accepted, and kept, as a perfect doctrine apostolic."

And again, it declares, as to the Articles of the Creed, that we must "interpret all the same things according to the self-same sentence and interpretation which the words of Scripture do signify, and the holy approved doctors of the Church do agreeably entreat and defend;" and that we must refuse and condemn all opinions, "which were, of long time past, condemned in the Four Holy Councils."<sup>§</sup>

The most authoritative testimony is borne to this point, also, by the Canons of the Church of England, agreed upon in the

\* Cranmer's Works, Vol. II, p. 356.

† *Ib.*, Vol. II, p. 14.

‡ *Ib.*, Vol. IV, p. 126.

§ *Formularies of Faith*, pp. 221 and 227.

Convocation of A. D. 1603. The XXX Canon declares, "Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practiced, that as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points, wherein they *were fallen, both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolic Churches* which were their first founders."\*

The Homilies, as the reader of them well knows, are full of this appeal to the Fathers and to Catholic testimony. Here is a specimen. "Before all things, this we must be sure of, especially, that this Supper be done and ministered, as our Lord and Saviour did and commanded to be done, as the Holy Apostles used it, and the good Fathers of the Primitive Church frequented it."†

The XXIV, of the XXXIX Articles, declares: "It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have Public Prayer in the Church or to Minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understood of the people."

The Preface to the Ordination Service adopted by the Reformers recognizes the same principle: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time, there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," &c.

And finally, Bishop Jewell, whose "Apology" is quoted authoritatively in the Thirtieth Canon as cited above, and whose famous challenge should never be forgotten, in that "Apology," defends the English Reformation distinctly on this ground, its Scriptural, Primitive and Catholic character. He says in it: "Our doctrine, which we may much better call the *Catholic doctrine of Christ*, is not so new as but that it is commended to us by the Ancient of Days, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in most ancient monuments, the prophets, and gospels, and writings of the apostles. . . . But, then, as to their religion, if it be so ancient as they pretend, *why do they not prove it so from the examples of the Primitive Church, from the Old Fathers, and the Ancient Councils?* Why doth so ancient a cause lie desolate and without a patron for so long a time? Indeed, they, the

\* Sparrow's Collection, Canon XXX. † Hom. on the Sacraments, Part III.  
VOL. X.—NO. II. 13

Romanists, never want fire and swords; but then, *as to the ancient Fathers and Councils, there is with them a deep silence.*"\*

Again. "We, the English Reformers, have approached, as nearly as possibly we could do, the Church of the Apostles, and the ancient Catholic Bishops and Fathers, which we know was yet a perfect, and, as Tertullian saith, an unspotted virgin, and not contaminated with any idolatry, or any great or public error. Neither have we only reformed our doctrine, and made it like theirs, but we have also brought the celebration of the Sacraments and the forms of our public rites and prayers to an exact resemblance with their institutions or customs."†

This rule, then, was the unerring guide of the English Reformers; HOLY SCRIPTURE INTERPRETED BY PRIMITIVE CATHOLIC ANTIQUITY. As Tertullian says: "This principle avails against all heresies. Whatsoever is first, is true; whatsoever is later, is adulterate." Given, the supernatural establishment of Christianity AS AN INSTITUTION; and from this rule there is no appeal. So, the English Reformers believed; and so, they acted. And the Anglican Reformed Church stood forth, restored to its pristine purity and beauty; Catholic, for every Truth of God; Protestant, against every Error of man. The Continental Reformation, on the contrary, proceeded upon a different basis. Its rule was, Holy Scripture interpreted by human reason; another name for private fancy, and perverse self-will. As this was the *ruling*, so it has been the *ruining* principle of the Continental Reformation; as it led the way to all those blasphemous conceits of the Rationalistic Schools of modern Germany, which have made that Reformation a failure and a by-word; and which are exerting such prodigious influence in England and our own country at the present day.

It would be easy to fill volumes with similar testimony, from the men who were the confessed and authoritative leaders in the great work of the English Reformation. Isolated opinions, of isolated men, can be quoted in defense of almost any whim which a papal, or a puritan partisan may choose to espouse. But we say, fearlessly, and challenge contradiction, that, in the language of another, "It was not because their doctrine was *Protestant*, but because it was *Catholic*, that our Reformers, and such Divines as Jewell, Nowell, Hooker and Andrews defended the doctrines of the English Reformation. And in the

---

\* Ch. V, Sec. 3.

† Ch. VI, 15.

declaration of Faith which our Reformers directed to be made by ministers, they were required to say of the Book of Common Prayer, 'that it is *Catholic*, apostolic, and most for the edifying of God's people.'"\*

The discussion to which we have invited attention, to many of our readers will not be new. But a compact statement of doctrines, on which the very foundations of the Church rest; and of an argument for those doctrines, which no boldness can question, or ingenuity evade, will not, we trust, be unacceptable to any; while, to some, away from books and authorities, and yet compelled to battle with the insolent pretensions of Rome on the one hand, and with a hydra-headed and bitter Sectism on the other, what we have written will, we venture to hope, prove a grateful offering. To our younger Clergy, especially, on whom the future glory and prosperity of the Church is so much to rest, our line of argument cannot be too familiar. Our Laity, too, who are clothed with such ecclesiastical powers in our Diocesan and General Synods, should learn what some of them never yet seem to have learned, that when, in the Creeds, they profess their belief in "One Catholic and Apostolic Church," they do not mean Popery. And every child in our Sunday Schools should be taught to understand, cherish, and revere, a Term, so much abused, and yet so hallowed with sainted memories, and pregnant with principles which are the very foundation of the Doctrine of Christ. The Papists are wiser than we in these matters.

This True Catholicity, in tone and temper, in Order, Ritual, and Doctrine—a Catholicity robed in the profoundest wisdom, and loftiest attainments, and most elegant culture which this world can give, and yet, kneeling at the Cross like a little child in deep humility, and asking what CHRIST would have us do—a Catholicity, which knows how to eschew the strait-laced metaphysics of Puritanism, the disgusting puerilities of Mediæval ceremonialism, and the cast-iron rigidity of a mere Literalism—a Catholicity, which has solidity as well as bulk; a heart as well as a head; and a heart which beats with all the intensity and fullness of this restless, stirring age—this is the Catholicity which the Church now needs.

Alas! alas! for the obdurate self-will; the noisy pharisaism; the bitterness and littleness of party hatred; the unscrupulousness of personal ambition; the crushing, grinding, hard-heartedness of Mammon-worship; the absolute dearth and barrenness of the Church's charities; the perpetual pleadings

---

\* Strype's Annals, Vol. I, Part I, p. 327.

and expostulations necessary to wring from the gripe of baptized misers the merest pittance, where all is CHRIST'S! It makes the head sick, and the heart faint, to see what ought to be, and yet, what is. Thank God! for glimmerings, here and there, of a brighter day.

The argument which we have given above, is as vital with us, as it is with our brethren of the English Church. For, in the character of the English Reformation, the Catholicity of our own Branch of the Church, is directly involved. Several of the volumes placed at the head of this Article—and the whole list is significant—show from what opposite points we have been, and are to be, assailed. Indeed, everything indicates, that, whether willing or unwilling, we are to be driven to the necessity of contending, with a Martyr's firmness and a Martyr's zeal, for the "Faith once delivered to the Saints." Alas! that it should be always true, that the Church's chiefest foes should "be they of her own household"! and that the Son of Man must always be betrayed with a kiss! The line of defense already pointed out, will, with God's help, prove a safe protection, let the assault come from whatsoever quarter it may. In an age of intense theological restlessness and conflict, the ultimate issues of which no one can yet fully predict, we have indicated the direction to which, in our judgment, the mind of the Church should be turned. Still, the Church's life flows from the old "Fountain of living waters."\* Still, her strength is in Him, Who standeth round about His people, even so, as "the hills stand about Jerusalem."†

---

\* Jer. ii, 13.

† Ps. cxxv, 2.



## ART. II.—EMERSON'S ENGLISH TRAITS.

*English Traits*. By R. W. EMERSON. Boston: 1856. Seventh thousand. 1857.

THERE is one point on which we are of the same mind with the author of this book. As there are many points on which we are of a very different mind from him, it is satisfactory to start with something concerning which we are agreed. This is the greatness of the subject he has written on. That he appreciates it, appears not only from repeated expressions in the course of his work, but from the title. He does not undertake in his three hundred duodecimo pages to set before us a complete image, but rather the few lineaments which he conceives himself to have seized and to have reproduced. It is not England, but simply *English Traits*, glimpses of the form, passing expressions of the countenance, scattered outlines of the maternally majesty of our mother-land. In this, he does well; he has our thanks, if he will accept them, for his comprehension of his theme and of himself. As Andrew Erskine wrote to Boswell, "there is a great deal of humility in your vanity."

We not only agree with Mr. Emerson on this point, but we mean to imitate him. The ten or twenty pages of an article afford no space for proper discourse upon England, or even upon *English Traits*. We confess the absurdity of attempting as much, even if there were stronger reasons for making the attempt. Fortunately, we feel no obligation, and we certainly have no desire to strain the reaches of our pen so far; what we wish to do, what we think it our bounden duty to do, is of a more limited, or at least of a more definite nature. A single chapter of Mr. Emerson's is to be our text. It is the thirteenth; its title, *Religion*. The *Westminster Review* pronounces it "perhaps the best in the book."

We speak of the Church of England. It would be presumptuous to say that we speak for her; enough if we speak of her in such a way as to exhibit the injustice that is done her in this volume. None have ever spoken, even of her, with deeper reverence for her beauty, her truth, her glory; none with readier acknowledgment of their own unfitness to do her justice, than we.

The Church of England in her relations with the sister Church of the United States, is the strongest tie between the two lands. We repeat it, in the very earnestness of our con-

victions—the strongest tie; stronger than blood, than language, than literature, than history, if literature and history can be set up as separate things from the Church to which both owe all that is highest and holiest in them. Nor is this a mere assertion. The experience of years, of the present hour, proves it a reality. Who amongst Englishmen have so soon forgotten the controversies of the past, who are now looking towards us with so friendly a smile upon their lips, so cordial a feeling in their hearts, as the Churchmen, the Catholic Churchmen of England? And who on our side give back the warmest sympathies to our brethren of the land from which our fathers came, who but the Catholic Churchmen of America? Who could be,—we do not fear to put the question literally,—who could be, or can be as united as those who, though of different countries, are of one faith, one Holy Catholic Church? Yet this bond is not recognized in the book, or the chapter before us. The author does not seek to sever it; he does not even seem to be aware of it. Like others of our countrymen, he prefers fainter sympathies, weaker ties with our kindred beyond the sea. It is for the Churchmen of America to take up the silver cord which they who are not Churchmen drop from careless hands. It is for the Churchman, if others join not in the anthem, to lift his own voice the more earnestly in swelling the strains in which England and America may unite heart to heart, and soul to soul, as one nation.

Mr. Emerson does more than ignore the means of union between the countries. He does what he can to weaken it by depreciating the Church of England. Here it is that we join issue with him. We have no intention of being personal or vituperative. Mr. Emerson's position is explicable, as we may find hereafter, on grounds that leave us no wish or right to quarrel with him; we meet him in sorrow, not in anger. But we meet him resolutely, earnestly; we have a cause to maintain against him, a cause of national and international, nay, of world wide importance, and there can be no shrinking on the part of one who understands its significance.

We do not mean to overestimate the effect of Mr. Emerson's discourse. To call it an argument, or an assault, would be making a great deal too much of it. In itself, it is of no moment. In its intent, so far as Mr. Emerson is concerned, it is equally trivial. "I have always been," he wrote long ago, "from my very incapacity of methodical writing, 'a chartered libertine,' free to worship and free to rail. . . . I could not give account of myself, if challenged. I could not possibly give you one of the arguments you cruelly hint at, on which

any doctrine of mine stands. For I do not know what arguments mean, in reference to any expression of a thought. I delight in telling what I think; but if you ask me how I dare to say so, or why it is so, I am the most helpless of mortal men." Nothing could be franker or fairer than this. It sets Mr. Emerson in the light in which he ought to be, and in which, if we understand him, he would wish to be,—not as an oracle, not as a seer, but as a simple, careless, meandering thinker,—a wayward rill without apparent source or outlet, rather than a full-volumed stream, springing high up amongst the mountains, flowing through long stretches of vale and plain, and issuing at last into the infinite sea of thought, of power and of beneficence.

Why then turn aside from graver contemplations to follow out this thread-like reverie? It looks as though we thought it might prove, if we did not think it already, of greater significance. The reason is very simple. Whatever Mr. Emerson's meditations are in themselves,—whatever his own honest opinion about them is, they are unquestionably regarded with very great reverence by a large number of men and women. He has his disciples; beyond their circle he has his admirers and his readers, the majority of all whom catch up the thoughts which he drops heedlessly, string them, pray by them, live by them. But for these followers, he would be harmless, an amiable spirit contending with no man, perverting no man, dreaming by himself and by himself bearing the consequences of his dreams. It is not so; if he dreams, others dream; if he speaks, others listen and speak in their turn; the chance expression from his lips becomes a watchword with them, the random sketch from his pen is made their ideal, their creed. To himself, he is the thinker; to them, he is the prophet, the milk-white annays of the Oriental paradise, the bird of graceful carriage and transcendent speech, whose eyes penetrate the recesses of mortal minds. This it is which renders Mr. Emerson and his sentiments important. What we should have no occasion to notice, were it merely his own utterance, demands instant and earnest attention, when it rises echoing and reëchoing from the band surrounding him—a band no longer confined to the shades of Concord or to the shores of New England, but spreading over the country and beyond the country to England and her dependencies. Our words will not reach them, we know before hand; but it is not the less our duty to speak.

One cannot but wish, in a connection like the present, that Christopher North had come nearer the mark when he said, "It is pleasant to know how immediately everything said or done in this world is forgotten. Murder a novel," he adds,

"or a man, or a poem, or a child—furnish Balaam to a London Magazine at thirty shillings per bray—in short, let a man commit any enormity, and it is forgotten before the first of the month. . . . Soap bubbles all—blown, burst, vanished and forgotten!" Not so, not so! The things that ought to be forgotten are too often remembered; nay, more, they grow, as they are remembered, more ominous than when they first appeared. It sometimes seems as if only what should be remembered is forgotten, like the sermon whereof Tickler speaks, in answering North. "I know a worthy and able minister of our church, who has been preaching (and long may he preach it) the self-same sermon for upwards of forty years. About the year 1802, I began to suspect him; but having then sat below him only for some dozen years or so, I could not, of course, in a matter of so much delicacy, trust to my very imperfect memory."

The suggestion from this experience of Tickler's is not to be resisted. That "self-same sermon for upwards of forty years" is exactly in the style of Mr. Emerson. He writes now, it seems to us, just what he wrote a score of years ago. He touches on various subjects, it is true, but it is always in the same vein, the same rambling, transitional tone of thought and of expression. This book, this chapter that we have in hand, is but the repetition of what we have had before; and though we do not pretend to familiarity with all Mr. Emerson's writings, we have read enough of them to recall the antecedents of these present theories. Whether this is consistency or shallowness, the reader may determine.

One thing is certain, that in taking the same stock of theories and the same style of utterances which he had already employed, to England, Mr. Emerson doomed himself to mistaken views and mistaken statements of what he was to see and hear. We mean all that we say, in saying that a man of our author's stamp could not comprehend England or her traits, much more her Church. We will go further. No dissenter of any stamp can thoroughly comprehend the mother-land. He is perplexed, confounded; he wonders here; he criticises there; declares that one man would be truer if he were out of the Church, or that another is too true to go into it; pities the nation for having such a burden as he thinks he sees it bearing; and in a word, assumes such a tone of compassion and indignation, of freedom and superiority, that his views not only of the Church and its relations, but of the country and the people, collectively and individually, become utterly distorted. How much such a spirit loses in the pilgrimage through England! What

blessed links with the present and the past, what sweet communings with mortal and with immortal natures, are passed by on the other side! The Churchman finds a home in England. The dissenter too often discerns but a show, a vanishing vision of error and of decay. If this is true of the dissenter generally, it is eminently true of one like Mr. Emerson. Others have the sympathies, or may have them, of the Christian with the Christian—of those who confess a LORD and SAVIOUR, though in their own way, with those who make the same confession in their fathers' way. But Mr. Emerson, unless we do him wrong, has no such sympathies as these. He cast off, years ago, all that could really unite him with the Christian Englishman. He spoke, it is true, in his speech at Manchester, of "the moral peculiarity of the Saxon race,—its commanding sense of right and wrong" as "that which lures a solitary American in the woods with a wish to see England." But read his book through, nay, read the mere speech through, and you will see that the conscience of the English is to be traced, according to him, in outward things; the inward mysteries, the interchanges of faith and hope and charity, deep in the hearts of the stranger and the nation, these were not for Mr. Emerson.

Yet he presumes to analyze the Church of England! Without penetrating, without even seeking to penetrate the life within, he lays his hand upon the forms without, and says, Lo, here! lo, there! At Salisbury, the crown and glory of the English Cathedrals, "we loitered," he says, "in the church outside the choir whilst service was said." At York, he ventures inside the choir to hear the Evening Service. "It was strange," is his strongest impression, "to hear the pretty pastoral of the betrothal of Rebecca and Isaac, in the morning of the world, read with circumstantiality in York Minster, on the 13th January, 1848, to the decorous English audience just fresh from the Times newspaper and their wine, and listening with all the devotion of national pride." What a stand-point! It reminds one of what Johnson said about Garrick: "He finds out the Latin by the meaning, rather than the meaning by the Latin." One saying of Johnson's is apt to recall another. "Sir," said he to a Presbyterian of Scotland, who talked to him of fat bishops and drowsy deans, "Sir, you know no more of our Church than a Hottentot."

Mr. Emerson's main position is taken at the outset of the chapter on Religion. "No people," he says, "at the present day can be explained by their national religion. They do not feel responsible for it; it lies far outside of them. Their loyal-

ty to truth, and their labor and expenditure rest on real foundations, and not on a national Church." Observe the antithesis in the closing line, "real foundations, and not on a national Church." A national Church, then, is unreal; not merely in England, we take it, but everywhere. It is far outside of the nation; they are not responsible for it, nor is it responsible for them; it cannot even explain them. We must get at the meaning of these statements before going beyond them; for they concern not only the Church of England, but every Church in the world.

Mr. Emerson intends nothing very serious. We must return to his own definition of what he is and aims at, or we shall attribute too much weight to his unusually oracular announcement in this place. He does not mean, good, easy man, to be oracular or threatening, not he; he throws out as one would blow a whiff from his cigar, the idea that a national Church—he means any Church—has no reality, and waits only to see it wreathing and vanishing before exhaling some fresh conception. But it comes up again, and more than once, as if he were actually impressed by it himself, and to deal fairly by him, we must get a sort of impression from it for ourselves. He thinks a Church a *simulacrum*, because it dates from the past, because its foundations have become concealed beneath the accumulations of ages; this is one reason. If we took him at his word, another reason would be the degeneration of the race to a point from which the Church could no longer be appreciated. "In seeing old castles and cathedrals," he remarks, "I sometimes say, as to-day in front of Dundee Church-tower, which is eight hundred years old, 'this was built by another and a better race than any that now look on it.'" In either case, whether the Church have grown too old, or the nation too degenerate, the conclusion is the same, namely, that the Church and the nation are no longer in harmony. Why Mr. Emerson should turn this against the Church rather than the nation, is not clear, but he does so; and pronounces the Church a discord to which men will listen with only closed or heedless ears. The theory at the bottom of all this is transparent. A Church is not for all generations; adapted to one, it becomes a burden to another; it has no precious ever-living truth to pour out upon every succeeding age, but what it gives to one, is so much gone, so much that another will never find. In this aspect,—the Church not merely a human, but a temporary institution, a kind of make-shift for this year or for that,—in this aspect, it must strike us as it strikes Mr. Emerson, that a national Church is altogether unreal. But that it never wears this aspect to a devout and thoughtful eye, need not be argued in these col-



umns. Should they fall into a stranger's hand, it will be enough for them to ask him to consult any Churchman whom he knows, and there will be no danger that Mr. Emerson's view will be regarded as the only one possible.

To go on with the chapter as it concerns the Church of England. "England felt the full heat of Christianity," says the author, "which fermented Europe. . . . Christianity lived by the love of the people. . . . The priest came out of the people, and sympathized with his class. The Church was the mediator, check and democratic principle in Europe. . . . The English Church has many certificates to show of humble, effective service in humanizing the people, in cheering and refining men, feeding, healing and educating. It has the seal of martyrs and confessors; the noblest books; a sublime architecture. . . . Heats and genial periods arrive in history, or shall we say plenitudes of Divine Presence, by which high tides are caused in the human spirit, and great virtues and talents appear, as in the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and again in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when the nation was full of genius and piety." So far, so good; the Church of England is confessed to have at least a noble, a saintly history.

But it is only a history. "The age of the Wickliffes, Cobhams, Arundels, Becketts; of the Latimers, Mores, Cranmers; of the Taylors, Leightons, Herberts; of the Sherlocks and Butlers, is gone. Silent revolutions in opinion have made it impossible that men like these should return, or find a place in their once sacred stalls. The spirit that dwelt in this Church has glided away to animate other activities; and they who come to the old shrines, find apes and players rustling the old garments. . . . Their religion is a quotation, their Church is a doll." "Coleridge," says Mr. Emerson in another chapter, "narrowed his mind in the attempt to reconcile the gothic rule and dogma of the Anglican Church with eternal ideas." There we have it all. The Church, once living, is now lingering, without men, without life, without even English elements of character and of power. And what has wrought the change? We are not told. "Silent revolutions in opinion" are mentioned, but not described; and we must fall back upon the alternative already brought out in connection with any national Church,—that the Church is old or the nation degenerate, one or the other; the Church in either case being the guilty party and therefore rightly sentenced to hollowness, hypocrisy and decay.

Let us pursue these lucubrations without as yet attempting

to controvert them. The Church is in decline; thus much Mr. Emerson considers established. But as its members are very numerous, its resources very extensive, its ramifications very vast, our author is driven to ask himself what supports this monstrous framework of a faith that has faded and fallen. His answers come like scattering shot. "The national temperament deeply enjoys the unbroken order and tradition of its Church; the liturgy, ceremony, architecture; the sober grace, the good company, the connection with the throne and with history which adorn it. . . . The gospel it preaches is, 'By taste are ye saved.'" Thus taste is one of the props; good-breeding, it appears, is another. "The religion of England is part of good-breeding. . . . It is the Church of the gentry. . . . It has a general good name for amenity and mildness. It is not in ordinary a persecuting Church; it is not inquisitorial, not even inquisitive,—is perfectly well-bred, and can shut its eyes on all proper occasions." There is also a political element in the adhesion which the Church receives. "The stability of the English nation is passionately enlisted to its support from its inextricable connection with the cause of public order, with politics and with the funds. . . . The Anglican clergy are identified with the aristocracy." After all, however, Mr. Emerson feels more secure in asserting that the Church owes its existence to the religious lethargy of the English. "The torpidity, on the side of religion of the vigorous English understanding, shows how much wit and folly can agree in one brain. . . . I suspect that there is in an Englishman's brain a valve that can be closed at pleasure, as an engineer shuts off steam. The most sensible and well-informed men possess the power of thinking just so far as the Bishop in religious matters, and as the Chancellor of the Exchequer in politics. They talk with courage and logic, and show you magnificent results; but the same men who have brought free-trade or geology, to their present standing, look grave and lofty, and shut down their valves, as soon as the conversation approaches the English Church. After that, you talk with a box-turtle."

We must interrupt our analysis for a moment. The picture of the author and his friend in free-trade or geology, is too good to be passed over without dwelling on its grouping and its expression. It needs but little imagination to call up the scene and the conversation, the flow of talk and pointed saying, perhaps on both sides—a little doubt in the Englishman's mind as to the standing of the stranger, a great deal of doubt in the stranger's mind as to the penetration of the Englishman,—but the train rolls on, the road seems smooth, the

carriage strong. Of a sudden, there is a check. Bless me, exclaims the Englishman, what have we here! A philosophic thought, replies the American; a bit of courage, a fragment of logic lies across the track, but we shall soon be moving all the more rapidly. But the delay is final. The grave and lofty look, the box-turtle attitude, has been taken; and Mr. Emerson leaves his companion with one proof more that the Church is dead and its members paralyzed. Did it never cross his mind that these were proofs of life? Was it beyond his instincts, beyond his imaginings, to conceive the love and reverence of those English hearts for the hallowed institutions under which they had been born, through which they possessed the Sacraments, and in allegiance to which their fathers had died as they themselves prayed that they might die? It is easy to call all this torpidity; much easier for one like Mr. Emerson, than to understand its true name.

But to return. The torpidity of the Church has its developments, which we must follow out with the author. "The doctrine of the Old Testament," he observes, "is the religion of England. . . . The English Church, undermined by German criticism, had nothing left but tradition. . . . The English, abhorring change in all things, abhorring it most in matters of religion, cling to the last rag of form. . . . The Church at this moment is much to be pitied. She has nothing left but possession. . . . Any examination is interdicted with screams of terror. . . . When the hierarchy is afraid of science and education, afraid of piety, afraid of tradition, [just now there was 'nothing left but tradition,'] and afraid of theology, there is nothing left but to quit a Church which is no longer one." Granted, granted; when these things are so, there will be no Church, but simply a hierarchy, a reign of terror, call it by what name you will. But is it so, is it so even to Mr. Emerson, in England? Will the "chartered libertine," as he has called himself, limit the realms of science, education, piety, tradition and theology, to his own range? It is of such a range as his that the hierarchy is afraid, and we cannot say that the fear is unfounded, considering the number of followers to every similar leader. But will Mr. Emerson have us think, will he himself think, that because the Church of England repels his science, his education, and the rest, that she repels the science and education of the Christian world? Not he, we believe, not he. It was but another breath of smoke that he threw out to watch it curling upward. Of his other fancies, we will take notice presently. But on that reign of terror we could not wait for

the proper place. Some thoughts act like instantaneous blisters; there's no getting into a comfortable posture before they begin to draw.

Mr. Emerson touches on some delicate points; we have seen it already, and there are other instances in store. "No chemist," he says, "has prospered in the attempt to crystalize a religion." It is his elliptical fashion of implying that the English Church would be crystalized, but for the impossibility of such a thing. "When wealth accrues to a chaplaincy, a bishopric, or rectorship, it requires moneyed men for its stewards. . . . The curates are ill paid, and the prelates are over paid. . . . A Bishop is only a surpliced merchant." "The Bishop is elected by the Dean and Prebends of the cathedral. The Queen sends these gentlemen a *congé d'élire*, or leave to elect; but also sends them the name of the person whom they are to elect. They go into the cathedral, chant and pray, and beseech the Holy Ghost to assist them in their choice; and after these invocations, invariably find that the dictates of the Holy Ghost agree with the recommendations of the Queen." Here, alas! the stranger has reason to doubt and to satirize; he has found sore spots, and we must bear with him if he probes deeply. But what shall we say of the conclusion to which he comes? "There is alive somewhere a man whose honesty reaches to this point also, that he shall not kneel to false gods. . . . England accepts this ornamented national Church, and it glazes the eyes, bloats the flesh, gives the voice a stentorous clang, and clouds the understanding of the receivers."

There, we have done with analysis. It has been no slight task to gather the disjointed utterances of the author into any sort of order. "The man was a chaos of truths," said Coleridge of another person to Mr. Emerson; and the expression may be applied to Mr. Emerson himself, though he is not a chaos of truths alone. We wish he were; but there are other things, which no mildness of language can term truths, that enter into and increase the confusion. We repeat it, drawing a long breath, that to get our author's ideas into shape has been no slight matter. Nor can we be sure that we have got them into the shape which he would confirm. Remember his own confession, "I could not give account of myself." Even if we satisfied him, we might still be adrift; the points selected might still be so far from one another, so severed, so broken, that no complete outline could be made out after all. "Learned and discreet reader," writes Southey in the Doctor, "if you should not always discern the track of associations over which I have passed as fleetly as Camilla over the standing corn; if

the story which I am relating to thee should seem in its course sometimes to double like a hare in her flight or in her sport, sometimes to bound forward like a jerboa or kangaroo, and with such a bound, that like Milton's Satan, it overleaps all bounds ; or even to skip like a flea, so as to be here, there and everywhere, taking any direction rather than that which will bring it within your catch ; learned and discreet reader, if any of these similitudes should have occurred to you, remember what Mr. Coleridge has said for himself formerly, and prophetically for me, *intelligenda non intellectum adfero.*" Well, well, we are glad that it is done. "There must be conclusions," as Nym says.

Mr. Emerson is at home in describing his sea voyage, or in touching on American landscape. He has an eye and a heart for the nature which is of the earth. But for that which is human, that which is heavenly, he has much less aptitude. To follow him as he threads the mazes of life and of faith, is to be filled with compassion, so far as we are concerned. He bears a glittering spear ; the breastplate upon his form throws back at times a dazzling reflection from the sun ; but the armor is loose, its most important pieces broken or lost, a suit of brittle fragments rather than of tempered steel. His movements are never certain ; his blows are not so much blows as demonstrations ; his weapon is rather brandished than wielded. Fortunately, perhaps ; for were it more vigorously handled, its imperfections might be more signally proved. Tom Purdie thought the American axe was fit only for *pairing a kebbuck*,—that is, trimming the thinnest of cheeses. What an instrument for the felling of an oak ! What a bauble to turn against the Church of England !

The Church of England is certainly a creation of the past. Its members rejoice, its brethren of kindred Churches rejoice that it is so. They look back with adoring gratitude to the days when their SAVIOUR instituted His Universal Church, to the later days in which His Apostles and their successors extended it, until it had spread far from its birthplace and the East, to the very islands of the West, to Britain, to England. The preservation of this dependence, to give it the most emphatic name it can bear, upon the ages of yore, is the deepest of the Churchman's purposes in relation to his Church ; the rupture of it, the keenest of his apprehensions. So far from thinking antiquity of structure a cause of weakness, he regards it as a tower of strength to the Church, to him, to every one within the hoary pile. On the other hand, he makes no depreciation of the present, of the principles and forms which age after age

has reared, to which the actual age is still adding, upon the original foundations. So far from that, he is ready to recognize the weaknesses of the past and to give praise that from many of them, and those the gravest, the present has been mercifully redeemed. The English Churchman, in looking back, beholds at one period, a prevailing corruption, when error of doctrine, oppressiveness of ritual and of discipline carried the day against all longings for purification, all attempts for reform; when the tyrant, with sentence of death on his lips and the warrant of execution in his hands, stood up against the confessor and the martyr. Generations later, the Church having professedly thrown off its corruptions, an era of blood arises; the victims fall by families, by communities, and the crosier of the persecuting prelate waves side by side with the sceptre of the persecuting monarch. To these scenes, it seems, the dissenter returns as to scenes of life, of holiness; the Churchman does not. He exults in the constancy of the persecuted; they, rather than the persecutors, are his brethren; but no exultation over an individual drowns the anguish excited for the whole of the Church; the time is a time of shame, of sin—let us thank God, we say, that it is gone. So far, therefore, from finding none but signs of life in the past, to match with which the present has only signs of death, the Churchman discovers in the Church of his own time, the more generous, the more elevating vitality. Not that he is blind to the infirmities of the later period; the truer his attachment, the keener his susceptibility; in such wise, that he who is most loyal to the Church is most strenuous against its perversions, whether they be of the body or of the separate members. But enough, and more than enough on this head; the substance of our assertions lies in a phrase, which is, that the life of the Church of England is not in the past, nor yet in the present alone, but in both, in the whole process of the ages.

It follows at once that the supports of the Church are rather different from those imagined by Mr. Emerson or the non-conformist in general. She is glad that her services should be tasteful and decorous; glad that the cultivated and refined should be, to so great a degree, amongst her members. Whatever adds to her grace and to her culture, adds to her influence for good; she would have gentleness mingling with her gravity; beauty with her solemnity, loveliness with her awfulness. The consequences of the impression which she thus produces give her no pain; why should they? They are the witnesses of her authority, of the hold that she has upon the consciences and the affections of her members. That her members should



confide in her, repose in her; that they should give up the more than questionable privilege of doubting, quarreling, denying; that they should live with one another and with her as if the Angels had really sung, "Peace, good will toward men," is no sign of torpor in her eyes. It is the pledge of faith, the seal of Christian confidence and rest. The more this spirit develops itself, the truer and the deeper she feels her life to be. If it confesses the Old Testament as well as the New, she recognizes her doctrine, her desire. She has taught what the Gospels teach, how the SAVIOUR in His first Sermon declared that He came, not to destroy, but to fulfill the ancient Covenant; how, after He had laid down His life, and taken it up again, He still referred to "Moses and all the Prophets," expounding "in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." It is enough for the Church of England, as for any branch of the Church Catholic, to know that CHRIST our LORD is in the Old Testament, as well as in the New. If in the professions or the practices of individuals, the truth is exaggerated into falsehood; if the man of taste, for instance, makes taste the single tie between him and the Church; if the confessor of the Old Testament confesses only a part of its doctrines, dwelling on its material and its human points, rather than on its spiritual and its Divine ones; this is no reproach to the body of believers. You might as well make your idea of an artist or of art in general depend on the lambkins of Mother Goose or the demons of Orcagna. The Church is not responsible for weaknesses or exaggerations against which she is perpetually exhorting and warning her children.

But setting weaknesses and exaggerations aside, the Church does not depend upon the principles that have been mentioned, not even on them in their integrity. She rests on much deeper, much broader, much more enduring supports than these. Her foundations are of Divine laying; her walls and spires have risen by Divine command; her breath is that which Christ breathed into her—where, when and how for the first time, it is not for us to say; her strength is that which CHRIST not only gave but still gives, abiding in her and in her members, as she and they abide in Him. Here and thus she lives—lives, though ages have rolled away since her life began—lives, though every generation has assailed her, sometimes through the unfaithfulness of her own children, sometimes through the ignorance or the malevolence of her enemies; and here and thus, it needs no prophet to tell, she will live until her HEAD and LORD requires her no more.

But the condition on which she holds her life is to be con-

fessed—confessed by her members and her friends. It is not that she should be merely the Church of England. Let those remember it, who would narrow her down within the rigid limits of that name; who cry, it is enough; we are a Church by ourselves; we ask nothing more, no sympathy, no coöperation beyond our own pale. Beware, beware, ye advocates of isolation. Your Church is no Church by itself or in itself alone; it is not a Vine, but a Branch, a Branch of the Church of Christ. Can it live without sharing in the life of the other Branches? Will all the sunshine of the heavens mature it as it hangs in the air; will the gracious blossom and the soul-satisfying fruit ever visit or crown it, if it seeks to be isolated? Not so; the Church of England exists only by virtue of her participation in the being of the Church Universal, the One Body of CHRIST.

It is only within a comparatively recent period that this great law, as it may be styled, has been revived in England. Fifty or a hundred years ago, it was sinking, if it had not actually sunk. The Church was declared complete in herself. It was but a step from this position to that of declaring her perfect. Here and there a more earnest voice was heard denouncing the folly and the impiety, as we do not hesitate to style it, of the mass of Churchmen; but a chorus of execrations would rise, and the voice die away within the limits of the Church, to be raised again without them, and this time, against the institutions for which it had so vainly sought to plead. Efforts languished; benevolent enterprises failed; Missions, extensions of the realm of Faith, got to be regarded as dreams; the life of the Church of England seemed to be ebbing away. But the turning-point was reached at last. The eyes of Churchmen were opened; they saw the lethargy creeping over their own body; they beheld the activity around them, not only in England but beyond her waters; the penetrating inquiries of the German; the presumptuous dogmas of the Roman; it was time to move, to expand, or to be fast bound for ever. It is not within our province to describe the movements that ensued. They form one of the great eras in the English, in the Catholic Church; and whatever may be their short-comings or their excesses, they have done what above all things needed to be done, they have restored the Church of England as a Branch of the Church Catholic, let us trust, for evermore.

It was not merely the hand of man that wrought the restoration. The Arm of God was lifted to raise the English Church to its old position in time for it to meet the thick-coming emer-

gencies of the age. Thousands and millions of untaught, of almost unteachable men, women and children, were clamorous for relief, for inspiration. Beyond the seas, worlds, rather than colonies, were calling for missionaries, for civilizers, for martyrs. At home, the struggle between those who would have the Church independent of the State, and those who would keep her dependent upon it, was about to begin; parties the least considerate towards the Church were rising to power in the State, while in the Church the hope of escaping this subservience to political influences was urging earnest men to restore the action of the Church in Councils of her own, where the Clergy and the Laity might meet on equal terms. Look at these momentous issues, and doubt, if you can, that the Church of England was put in her true place to meet them; nay, doubt, if you can, that until they are met, she is not really in her true place, not the Church Catholic that she hath been called to be.

To these heights of duty that surround the Church as the hills stand about Jerusalem, the way lies open, yet it is beset with difficulties within and without, behind and before. This is no place to expose them, but they may be recalled. Foremost amongst them are the parties into which Churchmen have divided themselves, often so fierce against one another, as to wear the look of hostile believers rather than of differing brethren; often so unscrupulous as to confess or deny the prayers, the Fathers, the very Scriptures of the Church, according to the relation of these holy things to their own purposes or intrigues. At other times, the indifference of various classes is such as to render preferable even the animosity of parties. Indeed, indifference is too mild a term; hypocrisy, treachery, would be more applicable, in some cases; the clergy enjoying cures that they do not administer, and preaching sermons that they do not write. What but this unfaithfulness explains the ground and lofty tumbling of the sectarian pulpits, the clowns of Exeter Hall and Surrey Gardens, where not a man in his right mind would think of going were the Churches what they ought to be! One of the intolerable hindrances to the Church is the closing of her sanctuaries; the great Minister of the city, the little chapel of the village being alike barred against the worshiper, except at a few prim seasons, unless—shame to confess it—the worshiper pays a fee to enter the house of prayer! “You owe it,” wrote Charles Lamb, seldom remembered as he should be, for his earnestness of heart, “You owe it to the venerableness of your ecclesiastical establishment, which is daily lessened and called in question

through these practices, to speak aloud your sense of them; never to desist raising your voice against them till they be totally done away with and abolished." But we stay the pen, lest we should seem to be falling in with Mr. Emerson, after all. It will not seem so, we trust; it will not appear that denunciation of the obstacles in the way of the Church is denouncing, but rather reverencing the Church herself—the Ark, the sacred hope of England, the Branch of the Church Catholic of CHRIST.

We must touch on one point more, the distinctive character of the English Church as a Branch of the Universal Church. Its experience, at the period of general rupture throughout Christendom, was not in all respects what a faithful Churchman loves to look back upon. But it may be said in general, without a shade of sensitiveness, that the Catholic Truth, the Truth at the heart of every genuine form of Christianity, was the life-blood of the English Reformation, and that in its circulation, vigorous and inspiring, it enabled the body of the Church to throw off the maladies of either extreme, whether of Romanism or of Protestantism. The character then assumed has never been laid aside; it still marks out the Church of England as so far ripe for labor, for glory and for blessedness.

We may seem to be in danger of what Sydney Smith called "the most grievous error into which a writer can possibly fall," namely, "to write without the fear of the deluge before one's eyes, and to handle a subject as if mankind could lounge over a pamphlet for ten years as before their submersion." But we have not yet done. Indeed the gravest, though not the longest portion of our Article, is yet to be written. Until we have attempted something towards explaining Mr. Emerson's views of the Church of England, as we hinted we should do, the most important portion of our duty is left undone. But we promise to remember the deluge as we go on.

It was during one of the darker periods to which we have alluded, in the history of the English Church, that the first Churchmen came to Jamestown and the first Puritans to Plymouth. They came not as members of a common household, intent upon building up a common home in the untried lands to which they repaired; they came as foes, to either of whom the success of the other was a sting, the peace of the other a curse. For this, we do not blame the Puritans alone. The shadows upon the infant settlements were not from them, we are ashamed to say, so much as from their antagonists. How, but for inflexibility in the Church, would the first Puritans have arisen; how, but for persecution from the Church, would others

have joined the first in one long, threatening front of resistance? Heaven knows we have little enough to rest on, as Churchmen, in that beclouded era.

The Puritan Colonies waxed numerous and strong. The bloody triumph of their brethren at home gave them a new impetus, which did not cease when their brethren fell; the restoration of the Church, if restoration it can be called, was one to corruption and to imbecility for the time being. Churchmen, contented at home, emigrated to the Western colonies in small numbers, and these at once from their paucity and their natural habitude of dependence upon the mother country, rather lingered than expanded. But it was impossible for the faithful to sit by and see the continent puritanized; the danger, whether springing from errors in the Church or from errors out of the Church, must be averted. From the shores of England there went forth many a devoted spirit, and many another arose on the shores of America, resolute to restore the unity that had been broken; nor was it the resolution of individuals merely, but that of associations, classes, in short, of the great body of influential and active Churchmen. Their work, however, was not so striking or so effective as one begun amongst the Puritans themselves, several of whose prominent personages, divines or brethren, returned from the wastes about them to the green pastures from which their fathers had wandered away. Then the limits of the Church extended North and South, and the process of reunion seemed to be on the eve of fulfillment. But the Revolution approached; the Churchmen, generally more attached to the mother country, took one course, the Puritans and their fellow-dissenters another, though not without signal exceptions on both sides. When the war broke out, a Churchman took command of the American army, led it and the whole nation through its stormy trial, and was hailed alike by Puritan and Papist, by Dissenter and Churchman, the Father of the Country. But it is not to be denied that the struggle for independence threw back Church matters half a century, and the beginning of our national, like the beginning of our colonial history, finds almost any other Christian body triumphant rather than the Church of England or the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America.

The fact that the Church thus started, so to speak, at a disadvantage, has led more than one of its earnest members into what we cannot but regard as an error. For ourselves, at any rate, we can see no satisfaction in calling our Faith an exotic, one that is alien to the instincts and to the wants of our coun-

trymen. Far otherwise; it is dissent in any and every form which we regard as foreign, derived as it is from the dissensions not of our own land, but of Europe. Behind the period of strife from which these warring creeds date their origin, there lies a period of peace when the Church of England and the Church of Europe were one. That it was also a period of corruption, that its unity was not maintained without sacrifices of purity and of holiness, is not to be ignored; but however dimmed, however dishonored the Catholic Faith, it was still the one wide-waving oriflamme of the Old World. Restored, emblazoned afresh as it was in England, it was transferred to our shores years before the Puritans came hither. That same standard is the natural, we have no hesitation in saying it, the natural rallying point of the various races that are mingled in the American. It calls them all from their scattered positions to gather on the common ground where their ancestry was once united; it makes no strained appeal, it asks no impossible sacrifice. Since Puritanism first seated itself upon our coasts it has been breaking up; it has given way everywhere, and in some spots where it was once peculiarly dominant, it has yielded to what may be called anarchy. On the other hand, the Church has grown strong where it was weak, strong even where it once had no existence at all. Which of the two is the exotic, which the natural growth of America?

All the greater, however, is the responsibility of the Church. Allow it to be an exotic institution, and the next thing to allow is that it must be supported by a few, or that, to be supported by the many, it must unbend, transform itself. Now no Churchman on earth can be farther than the writer of this Article from wishing the Church which he reveres to be swathed and motionless as a mummy. It is the daily plea with him that it should be "ramm'd with life," to use Ben Jonson's phrase, and that its life should be so generous, so versatile and so flexible as to fill the varying measures of those whom it gathers or whom it approaches. But this adaptation to the wants of humanity is one thing; a sacrifice of its own powers on the part of the Church would be quite another; indeed, the very opposite. Whatever constitutes the Church's life and the Church's power is to be retained, expanded, vivified, not because it is alien, but because it is kindred to the country, because it is fitted for the many, for the whole nation, with all their changing hopes and fears. For them, for the vast territory occupied by them, the Church is responsible before God and Man; not, indeed, that she must be accepted by the nation or else be condemned, but that she must do her best,



awaken her soul and stretch every nerve, to be accepted, to bless and to be blessed.

But it is not as a single isolated body, complete in its own panoply, that the Church is to win this immortal victory. She will find herself powerless, at least in proportion to the work before her, unless she arms herself with Catholic weapons. Just what we said of the Church of England may be repeated concerning the Church of the United States, without further writing, that her life and her labor depend upon her position as a Branch of the Universal Church of CHRIST.

She may do this more easily than the Church of England. All the years, all the resources of the latter cannot be made to counterbalance her dependence upon the State, her subjection to the merely worldly influences of parties and of ministers. The Church with us occupies a far higher elevation. No intrigues of candidates or of administrations mark her out for a victim. The strifes of factions and of sections leave her unharmed. Her skirts, trailing though they do from sea to sea, eastward and westward, from the granite of the north to the jungle of the south, catch in no frettings, no base compliances with the political machinery of the nation.

What then hinders the Church? What hems her in, year by year, so that she is still struggling as she moves on? The answer is written all around us. It is her own divisions, her own ignorances, if such a word may be used reverently, that close her advance, that turn what ought to be a triumphant progress into a halting amble. Of the parties which rack her with their contentions,—this is no place to describe them—the strongest, numerically, is one that dreads, yes, actually dreads her, dreads her strength, her sway; one that would keep the block a block forever, fearful of the statue, the majestic limbs, the awful countenance, that might be created from it; one to whom the idea of a Church Catholic is a precipice from which they must be perpetually pulling back, if they would not be dashed to fragments in the abyss that yawns beneath. Can we wonder that the holy work of the Church is yet to be done?

If there is one portion of the Church rather than another, where these millstones hang about her neck and drag her down, it is the diocese of Massachusetts. There the prevailing tone is dread, foreboding; truth, they say, is hurried, imperiled; they must put a break upon the wheels, or the annihilation will be instant and complete. Of course, there is a natural tendency to the other extreme, a danger of deifying the Church, of exalting it, we may say, to the throne of God, of worshiping it, rather than Him, of obeying its rubrics, real or imaginary,

rather than its universal and eternal realities. At the same time, we rejoice to discern a growing band of Catholic Churchmen, on whom the future of the diocese may safely depend; to the present, they are too few and too powerless to give a tone. The aspect of the Church in Massachusetts is that given to it by the majority; the aspect of a body of immense pretensions and immense apprehensions; denying, in one breath, confessing in another; and bending their whole energies, not to advance the Church, so much as to defend it; and not to defend it so much as to defend themselves, their prejudices and their weaknesses, against the Church itself. Thus absorbed in their own troubles, they see none of the immense opportunities before them. The State is strewn with the wrecks of Dissent; storm-tossed, and weary, the descendants of the old Puritans stretch forth their hands and ask for aid, for peace; but those to whom they turn are busy trimming their own bark, more terrified upon her unbroken deck, than the others upon the fragments of their foundered craft. But we will not despair: it cannot have been ordained that such an upheaving should take place without a result proportionate to the dangers and the agonies of the crisis. Massachusetts will yet be pacified and saved.

But why, it may be asked, this special reference? Why single out a diocese for exhibition and for lamentation? Because, to this diocese, territorially speaking, Mr. Emerson belongs. Because, from this he gathered the notions concerning the Church, preoccupied with which he went to England. Because, in this, as it is at present, neither he nor any like him, can learn, except by a miracle, to respect the Church of England, the Church of the United States, or even the Holy Church Universal.

## ART. III.—SALARIES OF THE CLERGY.

1. *Convention Address*, 1856. By the Rt. Rev. the BISHOP OF INDIANA.
2. *Convention Address*, 1856. By the Rt. Rev. the BISHOP OF ILLINOIS.

WHY should not a Minister of the Church be paid as well as a Teacher of Music, the Fine Arts in general, or even as adequately as a good bookkeeper? Is there any assignable reason why the services of a Clergyman should be received and enjoyed almost gratuitously, while other professional men are remunerated as a matter of course? We should wish much to see an essay or tract written in defense of the custom of restricting the incomes of the Clergy to such a limit as makes the support of their families one continued struggle. We should have much pleasure in replying to its arguments. But as those arguments have not been published, we shall endeavor to imagine them, and in this paper make some remarks on their validity. Before, however, entering on the discussion with such Christian Politico-Economists, a word or two of Preface may not be out of place.

*All* Christians speak of "the one thing needful." There is no difference of opinion concerning the tendency of Christ's Religion to promote happiness, and further civilization, yet strange to say, the class of men whose whole time and thought are devoted to the cause which men profess to love so well, are the worst paid, and the most laboriously worked of any body of educated men in the community. A Physician who visits family after family professionally is deemed a "laborer worthy of his hire;" but a Clergyman whose office it is to step into a sick man's room not for a few minutes only, but to remain hour after hour, administering such consolation as religion alone can give, must inhale the noxious vapor of infectious disease, as a matter of privilege to himself; he is sometimes considered deserving of gratitude, but generally nothing else. The praise of Miss Nightingale is in all the Churches, because with heroic spirit she voluntarily exposed herself to death on her errand of mercy. Yet hers is no isolated case, a something which never occurs in the annals of the Church. It was her sex and station in life that formed the peculiarity of

her case, and helped to attach to her name such enviable distinction. Now, does it never strike the Christian public, that in every city and town are to be found men, who have forsaken the comfort of home, and the prospects of ambition which other professions afford, for the purpose of walking through hospitals, visiting sick and afflicted families, and exposing themselves to dangers from which men who were not devoted to Christ would inevitably shrink. And this, and much more, they do for a pittance enough to support life, but not sufficient to maintain respectability. A Lawyer, who holds a brief from a client, demands and is paid his fee, whether he be successful or not in pleading his case; but a Minister—an ambassador holding a Brief from God, and pleading day after day with the ungodly and profane—is thought worthy of such remuneration as a skillful Mechanic would disdain. Hence we have the anomaly of a people spending on a cause they profess to have most at heart, less money than on most other items of ordinary expenditure. Professions indeed so much outrun performance, that were it not for some artificial spurs to benevolence, we should witness still more deplorable results in the Church. Perhaps at last profession might come to be considered so availing that the cry of “Lord, Lord” would be substituted altogether for “Doing the things which *He* said.”

Fortunately, as the world is circumstanced, it is creditable to character to speak of the progress of the Gospel; it tends to respectability to appear to take an interest in Ecclesiastical affairs. Many men, therefore, do pay money enough to maintain character and respectability, but far from enough to prove them, in the estimation of Scripture or reason, either honest or conscientious. Unworthy motives, of various other descriptions, help to fill the coffers of the Church. The steady Conservative who is fearful of Revolution, and dreads the name of Socialism, gives his five dollars to a Mission Fund, because he regards Missionaries (as they are) as a Moral Police to preserve the knowledge and practice of morality in the commonwealth. The wealthy Capitalist does the same, because Christian honesty is essential to the healthy progress of Commerce, and gives his mite, (as he calls it,) to convey the idea that he deserves to share the commendation bestowed by our Redeemer on one who gave all her living to God's Treasury. The successful man of the world, or the thriving farmer, gives his subscription to his Pastor's salary, because in his settlement, the society of an educated Clergyman is such an acquisition, and a Church in the neighborhood improves his property.

But we shall refrain from any further imputation of motives.

We have no desire to appear cynical, though in all honesty we protest that we might truly attribute even baser motives than these to many other classes of society in their contributions to religious purposes. It makes us sad to consider the result to the Church, were all the gifts to her support which originate in selfishness suddenly deducted from her resources. "We believe and therefore speak," and are driven to our conclusions sorely against our will by overwhelming evidence. The Clergy as a body are kept at starvation point. The problem which the Laity seem striving earnestly to solve is this, "What is the minimum amount of support compatible with moderate clerical efficiency?" We cannot help imputing base motives to the donors, when the recipients of their gifts are *said* to be an indispensable requisite, and their duties the most solemn imaginable, and yet the former are penuriously dealt with, and the latter miserably paid for. Should a man profess to value a Bible beyond gold and silver, and yet pay for it with a bad grace, striving to reduce its price and procure it at the uttermost farthing of abatement, we should doubt his veracity. Should a sick man, with protestations, declare that he believed fervently in the efficacy of a certain medicine, and yet make but little exertion and no sacrifice to obtain it, we should think him bent either on suicide or hypocrisy. Similarly, we cannot evade the inference, that the bulk of nominal Christians who read that "*Even so* hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel, shall live of the Gospel," are wickedly inconsistent, if they believe the text, and sadly hypocritical if they disbelieve it.

Now, we ought to look for some way of accounting for this wide-spread deviation from principle in the matter of Clerical maintenance. Selfishness, alone, cannot account for it. It must have some apparent assistance from expediency, or supposed sound reasoning. Because when a defect springs from pure selfishness, there is a remedy to be found in exposing it, till what is not done from a sense of duty, is at last done from a sense of shame. A mere exposition, however, of the hardships of Clerical life, of the difficulties the Clergy have to encounter in providing food and raiment for their families, of the pangs they have to endure from the humiliating process on which even what is given them is doled out,—a detailed statement of such grievances would perform but little good, and that little only temporarily. We must not only shame men into compliance with the requirements of the Bible, but convince them of the fallacy of those arguments by which their selfishness is fostered. And we know of no excuse for selfish-

ness more prevalent or more successful than the oft-repeated argument, that if the Clergy were too well paid, there would be at once a temptation to young men to enter the sacred Ministry from inferior motives. This is a pitiable apology for parsimony. Does it follow that because assiduous and competent Clergy are adequately paid, that the unprincipled or incompetent must be paid equally, or even employed at all? Because honest and industrious tradesmen are well remunerated, dishonest and idle men will no doubt learn trades, but must they necessarily be employed or receive high wages? The argument again is irrelevant, for the question is not whether the Clergy should be too well paid, not whether they should receive more than enough, but whether it be not the duty of the Church to see that they have a sufficiency. And besides its irrelevancy, the argument proves too much. For if the average income of a Clergyman (say \$400 per annum) be at present a security that unworthy motives will not actuate candidates for the Ministry, an income of \$100 would make the security still more secure. Nay, a promise of food and raiment alone, would make the guarantee still stronger.

It is worth considering also, that in all trades and professions the great majority never attain beyond a mere living; they are but able to live and nothing more. This fact, however, does not prevent thousands from daily recruiting the ranks of those professions. Why, then, does not the same rule hold good in the Clerical profession? Why are Clergymen more difficult to be procured, than tradesmen or lawyers? Clearly because they are not paid as well, proportionably, as other laborers, as also because there is an utter disparity between their income and the status in society they are expected to maintain. The fact, therefore, that the supply of Clergy is quite inadequate to the demand, proves incontestably that they are more inadequately paid than any other profession, because experience shows that multitudes enter on avocations in every other grade of life while the chances are incalculable against their ever attaining beyond a tolerable livelihood. Now, when we would claim for the Clergy *suitable* provision, it is no answer to talk of the ill-results likely to follow from a *luxurious* provision; when the Clergy are assimilated to other professional men in the payment of their labors, it will be time enough to quell the alarms of the objector. But let us suppose for a moment, that the stipends of the Clergy *were* such as to render the Ministry a desirable profession in a worldly point of view, we ask, is it not better that young men should be attracted to the work of evangelizing the world, even though the



motives at first were not wholly disinterested, than that the work should languish and die through want of laborers altogether? Suppose the number of candidates for Holy Orders largely increased owing to greater liberality in Clerical maintenance, may we not say with St. Paul, "What then? Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice."

Again, are those persons who are so scrupulous in reference to the purity of motive with which the Clergy should be influenced, and who make their scruples a pretext for economy—are such persons equally scrupulous in not throwing any obstacle in the way of Clerical devotedness? Do they require in the Clergy an abnegation of self merely, or do they not add to the load of self-denial by requiring in general that the Clergy should be married men? Do they demand that unalloyed disinterestedness should actuate the Clergy in taking Orders? So far well, but why call on them in addition literally "to hate wife and children?" It may be quite reasonable to demand that the ministry of reconciliation be not accepted for filthy lucre sake, but why insist on a Minister absolutely crushing the feelings of a man, and exhibiting to the world an illustration of one who cares not to "provide for his own household," placidly indifferent to his childrens' future welfare, or their present education? True it is, that the Saviour declared that when wife and children are brought into competition with him, they should be forsaken by the true disciple, but He never made the test so afflictive as to impose matrimony on his Ministers as an indispensable condition of ministerial usefulness.

But the world is more exacting than its Redeemer. It is notorious, that congregations are dissatisfied unless their Pastors are married, and that every imaginable method is used to intimate their wishes on the subject to their Ministers. It is whispered, what an advantage to the success of his labors, it would prove were he only married; how useful in his Parochial work a prudent wife might make herself; these and such like observations are continued until he is made to believe that marriage is a duty he owes to the Church, and thus is an additional weight of care and responsibility heaped on a Minister, already, it may be, sufficiently embarrassed in his effort to maintain a respectable appearance in society. Let those persons then, whose scruples prevent them from assisting to maintain the Clergy in comfort and independence, on the ground that there should be no temptations of a selfish kind to Clerical life, take the subject of celibacy into their serious

consideration. Few men like to take on them a vow, or, what is equivalent, a necessity of living in a state of celibacy. Let celibacy then be made a *sine quâ non* with candidates for Orders, and our objectors will have a still surer guarantee for purity of motive, while they will have the gratification of knowing that they are more merciful, as well as more consistent.

There can be no doubt of the fact, that many worthy men are deterred from the sacred Ministry by the belief that they are not called upon to expose their families to hardships which they would willingly encounter as individuals. Now a *competent* provision for the Clergy, while it would take away this plea for refraining from the work of the Ministry, would never of itself be sufficient (to the extent supposed) to induce persons to assume the responsibility of the Clerical profession from unworthy motives. When we remember that we must look for our principal supply of Clergy from the various Theological Schools, and that the bulk of the candidates will be derived from classes of young men who have to submit to long training prior to their Ordination, there can be little danger lest the ranks of the Clergy be filled up from the refuse of other professions, or with men who would accept a competency in the Church which they could not earn either in trade or literature. We would therefore express our honest conviction that the danger to be apprehended from the attraction of young men by a competent provision for the Clergy, is not worthy to be compared with the practical loss sustained with the repulsion of excellent men by an incompetent provision.

It is, also, seldom duly reflected on that the Clerical profession differs from all others in this respect, that the Clergy on taking upon themselves the vows of their sacred calling must renounce all ambition—the severest of all struggles to a gifted or aspiring mind. Let a Clergyman become settled as a Parish Priest, in nineteen-twentieths of cases he is at the top of his profession. It is easy to speak of his highest ambition as being by right necessarily centered in making converts and filling his Churches. True, indeed, such *is* the only ambition of multitudes; but is there no sacrifice in thus entering on a career in which the highest preferment is all at once gained, and where the same round of duties, with perhaps lessening remuneration, and grave apprehensions for the fate of their declining years form the daily task of their natural life? Would it not be considered a hard fate for a Medical or Legal Practitioner to be informed in the days of his health and activity, that when his professional income reached the sum of \$400 or \$600 per annum, he was to make no further progress in ambi-

tion or wealth? These are considerations that are becoming more and more significant. In a country like this, where amid free institutions and innumerable avenues to wealth and importance, a young man is excusable for aspiring to the highest honors, and most influential positions in society, it is self-evident that a candidate for the Clerical profession *must* make sacrifices. Give him, we say, a competency to live on, (and that is all we contend for,) and still there will remain a balance of self-denial sufficient to deter, in the great majority of instances, from the vows of Ordination, unless the Candidate be impelled by a desire to promote the honor of God and the edification of His Church.

But we will now look at this subject from another point of view. Admitting that the provision made for the maintenance of the Clergy were such as would attract and not repel young men from the profession, still we contend that the evil likely to arise from the operation of base motives on the part of some Candidates would be more than counterbalanced by the improvement that would be felt in the learning, talent and general superiority of the Clergy. The more numerous the aspirants, the larger the field from which the Ecclesiastical Authority can make selection. We hold it to be an obvious principle that it is (or should be) a desideratum in the Church to make that body to whose care are intrusted the solemn interests of man's eternal welfare, conspicuous for its ability and erudition. It is a matter of the greatest importance that the Clergy be not allowed to degenerate as a class. In these days when the adversary of the soul is so ably assisted by genius and learning enlisted on the side of infidelity, a thoroughly educated and able Ministry are of inestimable importance to the progress, nay, the very character of the Church. And while treating of this subject, we would not have our remarks misunderstood, as though we disbelieved the Scripture, which says, "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." We are far from placing reliance on man's unaided ability to bring the Gospel home with power to the soul. But as God has no need of man's talent and philosophy, when He would spread His Gospel and enlarge the borders of His Church, so we believe neither is ignorance nor mediocrity of talent essential to the success of Christianity. On the most sublime of topics let the highest intellect be expended, and it will not be expended in vain. Would that we might reasonably anticipate the prospect of witnessing the same amount of skill, accomplishment and ability which mark the world of trade or politics made subservient to the glorious task of defending true

religion and preaching the Word of the living God. Therefore, should a marked improvement in the temporal condition of the Clergy be the means of augmenting the number of applicants for Holy Orders, we contend that any selfishness of motive on the part of some Candidates would be more than counterbalanced by the facility afforded to our Bishops and congregations of selecting from a larger supply the most "apt and meet for their learning and godly conversation."

But we fancy we hear the objector of the class who give "grudgingly and of necessity," asserting that the Clergy are paid well enough, considering what they have to do. Here, again, we must join issue, and state our belief that no class of men perform more work under more trying and discouraging circumstances. Of course, the labors of the Clergy are not of that nature that publicity attends them all, and therefore they are comparatively unknown, but it would be a tedious task to enumerate the various items which go to make up a Clergyman's constant duty. There are two or more Sermons to be composed each week, written with the knowledge that they are liable to criticism, for delivery, composition and doctrine. This labor is, perhaps, the best known and appreciated of his duties, though the difficulty of keeping up the interest of a congregation requiring as it does, research and novelty in idea and expression, is not fully understood; especially as care is generally taken to avoid even the appearance of repeating an old sermon, however admirable in composition, or suitable to the occasion, it being considered a crime in a Clergyman to be detected in such guilty economy of labor. But, besides the preparation of sermons, and attendance on burials, and other rites of the Church, which are considered by some as a Clergyman's only duty, there is the ceaseless round of visiting; a labor which like upheaving the stone of Sisyphus, is completed only to be renewed; the attention to the Parochial and Sunday School, in keeping both teachers and children interested in the work and regular in attendance; the visitation of the sick; the painful, ever recurring duty that springs from being brought into contact with scenes of suffering, whether the result of sickness, destitution, or crime; the applications of the poor for assistance, and the emigrant for advice; the Confirmation Class and the Bible Class; the collection of funds for benevolent objects in general, but especially for the building of Churches; (this latter duty both distasteful and thankless, being for the most part imposed on the Clergy, who, like the Mendicant Friars of former days, itinerate on the business of their congregations;) the Lectures at

**Mechanics' Institutes and Literary Associations;**—these are but a part of the routine of duty which must be performed in any tolerably populous Parish, and they constitute, in the aggregate, severe labor, accompanied with great mental anxiety.

If this be a fair statement of a Clergyman's labor, (and who that is acquainted with the working of a Parish can doubt it?) let us see how he is remunerated. Having considered what he has to do, let us reflect on what he has to suffer. In the first place, the average income of the Clergy is miserably small; but the manner in which they are paid makes the matter still worse. The subscription list which should be promptly redeemed when due, is the source of many bitter feelings. A portion of the sum subscribed reaches the Minister, but it is accompanied with the remarks of the subscribers, which never fail to reach his ears. There is the humiliating innuendo, that the money is given from any other motive than love or respect; the feeling brought home to the Clergyman, that some of his supporters imagine that with their subscriptions they have purchased the right to dictate to him on all manner of subjects; he is made aware that some of his parishioners accuse him of this fault, or that neglect; by some he is charged with neglecting the poor, by others with courting the rich; and these rumors are specially rife on pay day. A few honest-hearted individuals, however, bring the subscription list nearly through the ordeal, and the result is, that the Minister is paid, though a balance be left due; and who, except the victim to such selfishness, can fully enter into the feelings of a Pastor thus treated by his flock? With hope and sanguine expectations, he entered on his charge, pleased with his work for its own sake; liberal himself, he expected liberality; and honest in his belief in Scripture and the Lord's ordination, that they "who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel," he hoped to receive cheerfully-paid remuneration. But after a few years of struggle with pecuniary difficulties, with an increasing family, and it may be, impaired health, having received his stipend or a portion of it more as reluctant alms than honest wages, can we wonder if he sinks under such a load, either into sad despondency or callous indifference? Are we to feel surprised, if when food and raiment for their families are made dependent on their keeping in the good graces of a wealthy parishioner, that some should fall into the snare and barter their independence of conduct for bread? Or, is it to be accounted strange, that a high-minded, impulsive Clergyman accused of such truckling to the great, should be tempted to offer unnecessary oppo-

sition or slight to an influential parishioner, in his eagerness to prove the independence of his character.

There is moreover an additional sting in such treatment of a Minister. The debt which is due is one of honor, not of legal obligation. He therefore feels that he is indeed neglected or despised when such a debt is repudiated by Christian men. His case is also peculiarly helpless; should he apply himself to trading, farming or speculation, notwithstanding every excuse of necessity, his character as a Clergyman would be compromised and his usefulness materially lessened. Retreat from his position is impossible; the "vows of God are upon him;" before him lies heartlessness and opposition; and behind him, the resource of secular employment which he may not attempt as dishonoring to his profession. Ardently, therefore, and emphatically do we adopt the language of the Bishop of Illinois in his Convention address: "Anything that can give the defenseless Minister who would and does suffer most deeply rather than complain, who would die rather than treat this sacred debt—on record with acknowledgment in God's book—as a question for an earthly suit; anything that can make him officially protected by the Church's sentiment and inquiry, will be of deep use and expanding effect, in its ramified influence for the purity and progress of the Church in our land."

The more, indeed, we reflect on this subject, the more amazing do we regard the treatment of God's Ministers by the mass of professing Christians. Considering that, as a class, they do not thrust themselves on the people who undertake their support, but enter on their duties by the solicitation and at the *call* of a number of highly respectable individuals, we must admit the existence of a criminal neglect of the precept "owe no man anything." Should a parish be vacant, or the organization of a new one be contemplated, the newspapers teem with regret at the religious *destitution* of the locality. There is a general commiseration excited, and an unprejudiced spectator would suppose that the presence of a resident Minister would be not only hailed as a boon, but paid for as a valued blessing. A Clergyman is sought for, and earnestly solicited to undertake the cure. He consents with hopeful anticipations, and the result too generally is such as we have attempted to detail. There is (it is true) a general demand on the part of the people for perfection of character and accomplishments in their Minister, and of course they are always disappointed; but it seems seldom to enter into their heads that it is well nigh impossible for a Clergyman to enter heart and soul into his duties unless he is at least independent in circumstances so as to be able to



meet the fair demands of his creditors. And yet a Clergyman, no more than any other man, can sit down to his work, to the composition of sermons, or proceed to visit his flock effectively, if his mind be burthened with the dread of want in his family, or the still graver apprehension, lest after all his preaching to others he should be compelled to appear himself as a bankrupt. He naturally broods over in his mind the ingratitude, or the thoughtlessness of his people. He thinks it but reasonable that the Church which required him to spend a large sum on a theological education should pay at least modest interest on his expenditure. He finds every day more and more necessity for study and research, in order that he may preach to advantage and cope on equal terms with the sceptic and schismatic, and yet he finds also that his slender pittance, doled out too, not as stipend, but alms, is barely adequate to the support of life, so that nothing is left to enable him to increase his library, or even to purchase a Periodical. Now we protest that this is a fair statement of the treatment of multitudes of worthy, talented and learned men; and we shall refuse to take as an excuse for it, any insinuations about the precedent of the fishermen of Galilee, and the good of souls being a reward in itself, until we see that a self-denying zeal and a threadbare coat become a passport to the good graces of our congregations.

Let us, however, pass from the consideration of Clerical support to the wide subject of Church support in general. And the more we scan and examine the whole system, the more fully must every unprejudiced man be impressed with the idea that there is an almost total lack of Evangelical motive influencing the contributors. We miss any traces of self-denial, sacrifice, abnegation of self, in short, any symptoms of acquiescence in the common sense observation of David, "I will not offer sacrifice unto the Lord, my God, of that which doth cost me nothing." The far greater facility of building Churches than of supporting Ministers arises in great measure notoriously from the fact that the former adds much to the value of property, while the latter is of course a constant demand on the resources of the people. Wherever we can see that there is tangible or apparent value received, we invariably find money freely given for religious purposes. Hence the popularity of Soirees, Tea Meetings, Bazaars, Donation Parties and eloquent Preachers; in each, and every one of these devices for gratifying self to the glory of God, we can on analysis detect the base precipitate of value received. In a leading newspaper we lately observed an advertisement of a

Soiree with a remark of approval by the Editor, because "the Soiree was now become one of our settled religious Institutions." The funds arising from the sale of tickets of admission to a pleasant gossiping tea party, are devoted to the sacred purposes of erecting a Church or converting the heathen; and should the proceeds be large or (what is equivalent) should the party be a taking one, the revelers are dismissed with the benediction and an address of congratulation "for the grace of God bestowed on the Church of——."

Again, multitudes expend money largely at Bazaars, who never give largely at any other time or place, just because they get *something* for their money, or are seduced into a temporary benevolence by the importunate raillery of Ladies. True it is, we can imagine a Bazaar got up under admissible circumstances; were the articles for sale made exclusively by persons who had little or no money to give to religious purposes, and who were yet desirous to aid a good work with the labor of their hands, while the purchasers were persons who did not confine their liberality to such occasions, buying for the express purpose of affording to the makers of the goods for sale the wished for privilege of assisting (in their only possible way) the object in view, *then* we should regard the design as a good one and allowable on Gospel principles. But it makes us shudder with apprehension for the fate of men, who, with motives the most selfish and earthly, can point to the Church or Parsonage (erected by the exertions of a few earnest-minded women) as a proof of the liberality of the Congregation, with whom they worship Him, "who, though He was rich, yet for their sake became poor." With precisely similar feelings, we regard donation visits, when made a pretext for an evening's amusement, or subscriptions to support an eloquent preacher, when little or nothing can be obtained to maintain a zealous Parish priest, who attaches more importance to the Prayers of the Church and the worship of God than to preaching to the people, and devotes more time to Parochial visiting than to such discourses as may tickle the fastidious ears of his flock. Indeed, the more deeply we ponder on the rise and progress of these Protestant Carnivals and Christian Saturnalia, the more amazed we become at the sad self-delusion of professing Christians. No Jesuitical sophistry, no fine drawing of texts, can by any possibility reconcile the manner of *giving to God* which now prevails, with the spirit of the Gospel, or the Offertory Sentences of the Church; and we are driven to the conclusion that the prevalent practice of endeavoring to serve at once God and Mammon, must spring from unbelief.

It may be said that the majority of contributors are really under the delusion that what they give is quite respectable and proportionate to their means and God's requirements. It may be so, but this admission must be made at the expense either of their consistency or their understanding. There is no palliation for such delusion but either neglect of the Bible or misunderstanding it. If the former be the cause, there must exist a melancholy inconsistency between profession and practice. If the latter, there must be a lamentable deficiency of intellect when the Scriptural doctrine of giving to the glory of God *can* be misinterpreted. We know, indeed, that the delusion we speak of is in a great degree fostered by the Public Press. A trifling donation to a Minister, or a paltry subscription to a Church, is often alluded to under the flattering heading, "Munificent Donation," or "Handsome Present." We clip (as an instance) the following announcement from the columns of an influential Journal:

*"Handsome Present to a Clergyman.*—We understand that series of meetings at S—— school house in R——, under the labors of the Rev. Mr. —, have resulted in the conversion of about fifty souls, many of whom are heads of families. On Friday night, when the Rev. gentleman was about to close the meeting for the night, he was interrupted by his Congregation while they proceeded to pay over to one of their number \$40, for the purpose of purchasing him a new cutter."

Observe in this announcement the lamentable *naïvète* with which it is intimated that \$40 was a handsome present from fifty converted souls to their Minister, being less than a dollar each for their conversion.

We give another notice of a different description, illustrating the mode in which Gospel Charity is made compatible with "fleshly lusts that war against the soul:"

"The Ladies' Circle of the Universalist Society, at Utica, will hold their Annual Festival at Mechanics' Hall, on Thursday next. They will give an Oyster Supper, and Smith's Quadrille Band will be in attendance. Tickets \$1. The avails of the Festival will be appropriated towards paying off the Organ debt." Here we are openly informed that any money that shall be available after the company have regaled themselves with oysters, and amused themselves with dancing, ad libitum—any remnant of the funds after expenses are defrayed, shall be applied to payment for an Organ, wherewith to "praise God in his holiness and the firmament of his power." Such extracts might be multiplied at will, and the most disheartening feature of the case arises from the fact that the Press does

not lead public opinion, but follows it on such matters. It may and does foster, but cannot create such a perversion of right judgment as calls "the vile man liberal or the churl bountiful." No, this unscriptural standard of motive and extent in our donations to God, has become so ingrained in the Christian public, that nothing but a total revolution of sentiment, arising from a prayerful and impartial study of the Scriptures, will force men into the right, though long neglected path of duty—the duty of giving, as a minimum, one-tenth of our income to the Treasury of God.

We are, however, in this Article, concerned chiefly with the question of clerical maintenance, though it is difficult to treat of it without allusion to the general question of Church support. Space will not permit us to extend our remarks to this general question, further than to lay down the principle of self-denial as a necessary qualification for rendering our good works acceptable to God. No one (as far as we know) dreams of disavowing this Gospel principle as an unnecessary one; and yet plain as it is in operation, and Scriptural as it is in theory, it is a stranger to the great mass of Christian people practically. So evidently is this principle connected with religious profession theoretically, that the Clergy are required to become practical illustrations of it. Unless a Clergyman is a self-denying man, he is lightly esteemed. Now we claim for the Clergy, as a body, a self-denying character. Rightly and Scripturally do they deserve it, but we protest against the attempt to perform any Christian duty by proxy. The devotedness of the Clergy will not atone for the illiberality of the Laity. It will not make amends for the parsimony of men who fare sumptuously every day, that their spiritual teachers were forced to assume compulsory vows of poverty—"Every man must give account of himself to God." An idea, springing from the absence of self-denial in the Laity, is a main cause of the poverty of the Clergy. We mean the erroneous opinion that the obligation to support them extends no further than payment can be demanded from their congregation for services rendered to the members individually. On this principle, a man who attends Divine Service regularly every Sunday, is bound to pay twice as much as one who attends alternate Sundays only. The convenience of having a Minister to officiate, and the advantage taken of such convenience, are the only items of consideration when payment is demanded. It is forgotten that every Christian is, on Gospel principles, a Missionary. He must, either personally or by others, preach the Gospel. Though incapacity, caused by illness, age, or distance from the house of God, should prevent

any from individually profiting by the Ordinances of the Church, the duty still lies on them to see that the poor have the Gospel preached to them, and that the work of evangelizing the world be not retarded through want of means, so long as they possess the power of assisting the laborers. This view of the matter is almost wholly ignored. The subscription, or pew rent is paid, as remuneration for the enjoyment of the Sermon, or the convenience of the seat, with total neglect of fellow Christians who have neither one or the other. And what is the effect on the world at large? Infidelity is greatly promoted by this conduct of believers. The unbelieving man of the world sees the cushioned pew with its velvet apparatus and luxurious accommodation, rented according to its value, on the same principle precisely as a box at the Opera. He sees, moreover, in many instances, the occupant limiting his donations to the cause of religion to that rent. There is no trace of self-denial, and the worldling naturally concludes that this church-going is the man's foible, like a taste for articles of virtue, or literary refinement; it is his hobby, and that he neither cares for his brethren, nor believes, himself, in the doctrines of the Church.

Such is one evil arising from the absence of self-denial in our offerings. Another, of course, is the utter disproportion between the contributions of the Church and the necessities of the times. It is no reply to our strictures to point to the number of Churches and the respectable appearance of the Clergy in our cities. There is no more self-denial in the cities than in the rural districts; the more efficient support of the Clergy in the former, is due more to the number and wealth of their parishioners than to self-denial. Not unfrequently such Parishes contain single individuals, a tithe of whose income would exceed the whole expenses of the Parish and their charities besides. And then a small sum from each member assumes in the aggregate quite respectable proportions; and yet even in such favored localities, there is room for more Ministers and more Churches. Besides, cities, attracting as they do the ablest of the Clergy, no doubt exhibit all the results likely to follow brilliant appeals and talented labor. We therefore affirm, that not even in the most apparently prosperous phases of clerical maintenance, is there evident proof of a self-denying, evangelical principle being the actuating motive of Christian Churchmen. And as a necessary consequence of the poverty of the Clergy, restlessness ensues, a desire of shifting and changing from one sphere of duty to another, an evil now so prevalent as to call for the warning voice of our Bishops. The restric-

tion of the gifts of the Laity to a standard regulated by avarice, the supposed value of clerical duty, or the amount given by richer neighbors, has entailed poverty on the Clergy, and the evil of constant change on Parishes.

The truth is, penury is no recommendation to a Clergyman, however holy he may be. Piety in rags, in vain seeks admission to our pulpits, or the *entree* to our drawing-rooms. This the Clergy well know. They feel that if unable to maintain a decent exterior, the poor will be tempted to despise them, and the rich to neglect them. Naturally, therefore, do they seek for a Parish where a better income will enable them to do their duty under more favorable circumstances and from a more commanding position, and thus does the lack of suitable maintenance lead to the constant removal so prevalent, and snaps asunder a bond of love and respect which a long period of intercourse engenders between a Clergyman and his flock.

Complete worldliness of motive in giving, is also a main stay of the pew system. A large amount of stipend reaches the clergy under that system, which (unless the grace of God prevent the evil) would otherwise never be obtained. A pew holder who is dissatisfied with his Minister will not, for the most part, punish himself by surrendering his pew, in order to annoy his Pastor. The pew system being a species of indirect taxation from the proceeds of which the executive officers of the Church are paid, affords in many cases a better, always a more certain income than a subscription list. And as the payment of indirect taxation does not necessarily entitle a man to the name of Patriot, similarly the payment of pew rent cannot obtain for a Christian the character of "a cheerful giver." A man will not deprive his family of the luxuries of life because an unpopular Secretary of State is paid his salary out of taxes on such luxuries; there is therefore no Patriotism in the payment of indirect taxation. But should a political emergency arise, and the Treasury be well nigh empty, then indeed if a man come forward and subscribe liberally in his country's aid, he would earn for himself the title of Patriot. Now there is ever such an emergency in the Church of Christ; and he alone who pays his contribution, without reference to any return in the shape of an easy pew, or a pleasing sermon, deserves the designation of a good and faithful servant of Christ. The result of such a state of things is this, that the Clergy of two evils choose the least, and prefer the certain income from pew rents to the very uncertain one from voluntary donations. They are thus directly interested in supporting a system which is fearfully retarding the popularity and growth



of the Church. Only let the laity once show their practical belief in the doctrine that every baptized Christian is bound to give not according to caprice, but "as God hath prospered him," and forthwith, as far as the Clergy are concerned, the doom of pews is sealed; and those partitions originally erected to screen Puritan irreverence from the eye of the law, will no longer disfigure the House, nor distinguish the worshippers of God.

Nor, let any false inference be drawn from these remarks as though nothing but selfish motives prevented the Clergy from declaring in favor of Free Churches. The mass of the Clergy are, on principle, opposed to the present system of subdividing the area of our churches *into lots to suit purchasers*. But, then they foresee that the small stipends which they at present receive from pew rents are likely to become smaller still under the Free Church system, *unless the principle of the pew holders be changed*; and that thus the evils arising from the pauperism of the Clergy will be greatly increased by greater aversion on the part of young men to enter the ministry, and by the degradation of the clerical body socially. Pews may be made free, more easily than the occupant made liberal. The Clergy are therefore apprehensive as to the result of a wide-spread change to the Free system. They (or at least a large number of them) think that the Church is not prepared for it, or in other words, not yet sufficiently imbued with Evangelical principles on the subject of giving. They dread a failure of the experiment. They know that should there be a decided want of success in carrying out Free Churchism, the old system of Pews will be riveted tighter than ever on themselves and their children. They are therefore timid as to the result, though the majority have little doubts as to the comparative merit of the two Systems, as viewed in the light of Scripture or reason.

We therefore reiterate our belief, that if Churchmen would perform their duty in giving one-tenth of their means to the cause of God and the Church, there would soon be no repugnance to Free Churches, and that new principles in giving would lead to new principles in other things, one of which we suspect would be, the recognition of the right of the poor to "have the Gospel preached to them." But it may be replied, what is to prevent a man from paying his tithe and yet retaining his pew? The tithe may be regularly paid, and yet pride and exclusiveness combine to perpetuate the appropriation of seats. We think not. Whenever such a revolution comes over the Church, as will make her members as liberal as the Jews of old, we shall witness still further progress in the right direction. The heart which is sufficiently enlarged to pay a tenth,

because the Scripture requires it, will, we imagine, next obey the precept which bids us "preach the Gospel to every creature." The man who at the call of principle checks his covetousness by giving a tenth, will also surrender his pride by resigning his pew. And let it not be forgotten that if the members of the Church were thus liberal, sufficient church room might be provided so as to afford a pew to every Episcopalian family in the land—the only consummation which could be pleaded as an apology for not adopting Free Churchism.

We fear that some of our remarks may be regarded as too sweeping, or misinterpreted; as though we believed that there is nothing being done in the way of liberality to the Church on true Evangelical principle. We deprecate such false deduction. Thank God, there are in His Church a remnant that have not bowed the knee to Mammon. But, alas! they are but a REMNANT. The great mass of Christians are not self-denying men. Their Offerings lack that incense which can alone recommend them—a self-denying zeal, an effort to imitate the Saviour in his self-sacrificing devotedness. And yet a *Jew* was commanded by Jehovah to offer thirty per cent. of his income to maintain the Priesthood, the Temple and the poor. Is a Christian's obligation less? Are there not the very same virtues to be educed and strengthened under the Dispensation of the Gospel, as were required to be exercised under the Law? It would have been no difficult matter to have apportioned a part of Canaan to the Levites had God so willed it; but this tribe of God's ministering servants was to be supported by the remaining tribes for the express purpose of training them up in the practice of self-denial and of compelling them to acknowledge and feel that the silver and gold were the Lord's. The belief that they were but trustees for Jehovah—that it were as great a crime to withhold His tithe as to appropriate the trust money of a neighbor, was thus instrumental in keeping up a constant recognition of God's sovereignty and man's dependence. The effect on the Jewish mind intended to be produced by the requirement of tenths and offerings is well expressed by David when in the fullness of his joy at the freewill offerings of his people, he exclaimed, "For all things come of thee and of thine own have we given thee."

Now, where is the assignable reason for not fostering and perpetuating the same high moral feeling in the Christian Church? Why is the standard of self-denial lowered in the Church? Is self-denial one of those carnal ordinances, which were abolished by the Gospel? Or, if it be admitted, that it is still a virtue, immutable in its nature, we ask again is its

standard degraded? Under God's special government, a Jew was trained to self-denial and a confession of his dependence upon God by the demand of a tenth of his worldly substance; and can a Christian be perfected in the same grace on easier terms? The funds of God's treasury contributed by Jews were required for the Jewish poor and the Jewish Ritual exclusively; and yet a tenth was the minimum donation. Millions of heathens are thrown on the mercy of the Church now; and a tenth is not even an acknowledged obligation. The systematic payment of tithe tests sincerity, and is to some extent, self-denial to all. Hence, its unpopularity. Hence, the endeavor to evade it, and to prove its burden no part of the Gospel system.

But, setting aside all allusion to tithe, casting away System altogether for the sake of argument, let the Christian Church read, mark and inwardly digest these words, "If any man will come after ME, let him DENY himself." If then a tenth be given, and yet cause no self-denial, a tenth is too little; if a fifth can be spared, without feeling its loss; if it be bestowed and yet no restriction ensue to the vanity or pride of life, then a fifth is not enough. But we forbear; the truths of God cannot be expressed precisely in arithmetical terms, there is however one rule which no skill can evade or ingenuity misinterpret, and it is this: "*If any man will come after me, let him deny himself.*"

In one respect, the Christian Priesthood is made to resemble the Levitical. They must have no part nor inheritance among the people. They must refrain from the mart, the office, and the labor of their hands. The Church more exacting than in primitive times forbids them to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. Tent-makers they cannot be. But here the similarity ceases. The value received, or rather expected by Christians, differs from that expected by Jews. In the case of the latter, it consisted in the consciousness of having obeyed the divine law; in the habit of self-denial thus formed; in the constant remembrance of Him "who gave them power to get wealth;" and in the gradual preparation for the resignation of all property at death. And who will contend that similar practice in the Christian Church will not produce similar results? Let a disinterested spectator *honestly* say, what is in fact the value expected in return for the offerings of too many Christians! Perhaps in giving less, they expect less in return than the Jew. But the value, too often expected is the comfortable pew; the membership in a fashionable congregation; the eloquent discourse; the name of respectability; the improvement of property; the escape from importunity; the satisfaction of not being outdone; the fascinating Ritual; the

delightful music ; the character for liberality ; and the gratification of ostentation. We mean, these must be the return expected by the large proportion of donors, *because* their donations are generally limited to that sum which the foregoing motives naturally suggest and account for. If the Love of Christ constrained to self-denial, such a spectacle as that of a wealthy congregation in a splendid temple, expending on themselves, more than on their needy and destitute brethren, could not be presented to our view. Did true Christian principle actuate the Church, so many of her members would not be content to live in luxurious ease, while the privations of the Clergy were unrelieved, or the Means of Grace withheld from a large proportion of the population. .

## ART. IV.—THE REV. STEPHEN R. WRIGHT.

THE life of a faithful Minister of JESUS CHRIST, who, sacrificing worldly honors, pursuits and pleasures, yields himself up to the service of his Divine Master, ought always to be dear to the heart of the Church ; and there are occasions when the record of such labors deserves to be preserved, as due to the memory of the departed, as an incitement to the living, as a rebuke to the sluggish and the worldly, and as an honor and praise to the Great Head of the Church.

Besides, there is a special charm in Biography, above the power of mere precept. It is duty in action ; addressing our habit of imitation ; challenging, alike, our curiosity and our sympathy ; encouraging our fearful hearts as it points to victory achieved by men frail and helpless as ourselves. Professor Tholuck, of the University of Halle, the very best of modern Germans, and who is laboring so earnestly to resist the tide of modern infidelity now sweeping over that unfortunate country ; not the scoffing infidelity of Frederick and Voltaire, and D'Alembert, but of Bauer, and Bretschneider, and Feuerbach—Tholuck, lately said, "the biography of the Missionary, HENRY MARTYN, the man who was known, even among the Persian Mohammedans, as the holy—opened also in my own life, a new era of religious progress." Would that our own American Church Literature were far richer than it is, in the recorded lives, not of our controversial pugilists, nor of our noisy partisans, nor of those self-satisfied persons whose vocation it seems to be, to be perpetually publishing to the world how much more pious they are than other people ; but of those "holy and humble Men of heart," who, having faithfully, and patiently, and meekly, borne the burden and heat of the day, do now rest from their labors. The Church does high honor to herself, when she shows that she knows how to honor unobtrusive, unostentatious, noiseless worth.

Such an instance occurs in the recent death of the Rev. STEPHEN R. WRIGHT. He was almost unknown to fame. The incense of popular applause, offered up to that gaudy butterfly, the mere fashionable preacher of the day, he knew not and sought not. Although a ripe scholar, and possessing a mind enriched with thorough and varied study, still it was not in profound scholarship, that his rare excellence is to be sought. For there was, indeed, that in him, and about him, which for-

bids that he should pass from our midst without a tribute paid to his worth.

STEPHEN R. WRIGHT was born in Hingham, Mass., Feb. 15, A. D. 1812. His maternal grandfather was a Mr. Richardson, a descendant, as is supposed, of the Thomas Richardson, a Puritan, who sailed in the "Speedwell" from London for Boston, in A. D. 1656, and from whom Mr. WRIGHT derived his middle name. In early life, he removed to Vermont, where he received his education, and graduated with distinction at Middlebury College, A. D. 1835. Immediately after receiving his Collegiate degree, he removed to North Alabama, and from thence to Montgomery, in the same State. Here, he occupied himself very assiduously and laboriously, in teaching a male school, until the summer of 1838, when he was elected, by the Trustees of the Marion (Alabama) Female Seminary, President of that Institution; which appointment he accepted and immediately removed to Marion. Mr. Wright and his lady remained the Principals of the "Marion Female Seminary," for a number of years, and under their charge, that Institution enjoyed a very large amount of patronage and prosperity, and acquired the reputation of being one of the best and most successful institutions in the South. After resigning the Presidency of the above Seminary, Mr. Wright took charge of a large Academy in Selma, Alabama, which was established and sustained by the Masonic Fraternity of that State. After remaining several sessions in that Institution, he removed to the neighboring village of Union Town, where he conducted a flourishing, and now, prominent female school.

He was admitted to the Presbyterian ministry at Marion, Ala., in 1841. Although called specially to the work of Christian education, yet while he had charge of Institutions of learning, he seldom spent a Sunday without holding religious services, riding sometimes forty miles to preach to masters and servants, after teaching all the week, and returning so as to resume his labors on Monday morning.

Mr. Wright was married in Dec. 1837, to Miss Catharine H. Allen, daughter of the Rev. Jason Allen, who, for sixteen years, was pastor of a Congregational parish in Woodbridge, Conn. She received her education at New Haven, and often attended the Services of the Church at Trinity, then, as now, under the charge of the Rev. Dr. Croswell. We may add here, that she survives her lamented husband; and that she conducts, with ability and success, a flourishing Ladies' Seminary in Matagorda, Texas, where Mr. Wright died. A worthy help-meet to her husband while living, she still, as far as in



her lies, keeps the fire brightly burning on the altar which he erected. The Church needs more such Missionaries' wives; and ought to patronize the Schools where the daughters of the Church are trained up for Christ and His service; especially in this sensuous, superficial, extravagant, and worldly age. The prevalent tone of feeling, the aim and ambition of too many parents, and Church parents, too, in the education of their daughters, are death to everything that is high, and noble, and true, in the heart of the young female disciple of the Cross. And, as our pages will meet the eye of many a Church parent, we take this occasion to say, that there are Christian Schools, and of the highest intellectual and æsthetic order, where the truest Christian sensibility is cherished, where holy resolutions are encouraged, and where the Faith and Order of Christ's Church are distinctly recognized. Next to our Colleges, at least, do such nurseries of the Church deserve the fostering care and patronage of all who profess and call themselves Churchmen. Fearful is the hazard they run, who, for some fancied superiority, entrust the souls of their daughters to the cunning wiles even of the Jesuits. And, we may add, bitter are the tears which some of these have shed as a consequence of such folly. It was while Mr. Wright was at Uniontown, that the change in his ecclesiastical views took place; a change, so marked by intelligent conviction and heroic resolve, that it deserves to be treasured up by the Church as an evidence of the strength of her claims when fairly presented to an ingenuous and honest mind. It is best told in his own words, as follows:

*Statement of the late Rev. S. R. Wright, read at the time of his Confirmation, in the Church of the Holy Cross, Uniontown, Ala., on the 13th Sunday after Trinity, 1853.*

I feel it due to myself, and to my beloved brethren in Christ, with whom I have been hitherto associated in bonds of fraternal Christian fellowship, to make a simple statement of the circumstances which have led to my present change of views, devolving upon me the necessity and duty of dissolving my ecclesiastical connection with them; a connection especially endeared to me by long years of the pleasantest social Christian intercourse, and of corresponding interchanges of mutual Christian confidence and affection. This change is as surprising and unexpected to myself, as it can be to any of my Christian friends. By education and conviction, I have been loyally a Presbyterian, sincerely attached to the Presby-

terian Church—to her excellent ministry, polity, order and doctrines—to her admirable schemes of benevolence, and aggressive plans for the spread of the Gospel.

I have hitherto regarded the question of ministerial authority, in common with most of the dissenting clergy, as peculiar neither to PARITY NOR IMPARITY, but as equally belonging to both; I have, consequently, deemed the points of difference between them as of very minor importance. My own mind conversant *with* and fortified *by* the ordinary arguments in favor of the *parity* of the ministry, was, until of recent date, perfectly satisfied and at rest on the subject. With these views of the ministry, with an instinctive aversion to controversial divinity, and strong in my convictions on the subject, and regarding the *divine* claims of Episcopacy as an ecclesiastical fiction, unauthorized by Scripture and the Church's earliest history, I devoted myself to other departments of theology more congenial to my tastes and feelings, than what I conceived to be this dry and unprofitable controversy. About three years ago, prompted by literary curiosity and taste, I took up Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity to read, merely as a theological and literary classic,—having always understood it to be a splendid specimen of logical and consequential reasoning, conducted in the most skillful and scholarly manner, and in the most excellent and truth-loving spirit. I had read the life of Hooker by Isaac Walton. I was prepared to appreciate his resplendent genius and learning and deep piety, but not to be won by his eloquence and subdued by his arguments. In that incomparable and unanswerable work, I need not say that I found the question of Episcopacy stated to my mind in an entirely new, striking and original light, and overwhelmingly sustained in all the points at issue, by the splendors of unequalled demonstration and cumulative argument. I felt my long-cherished convictions giving way; but to surrender them, involved such unpleasant consequences as to bring me to a pause.

Pride of intellect, pride of consistency—my period of life and pleasant Christian relations—a sincere attachment to my Church, and to her devoted and intelligent ministry—the faith of my family and kindred—the faith of that maternal heart which embalmed my infancy in prayer and devoted me in Baptism to God, and had taught my earliest childhood to lisp "*Our Father*," and the other sweet lessons of maternal piety—these, and other considerations, induced me to hesitate, and to hope that I might be able, by a more general and thorough review and examination of the subject, to *resettle* my mind in

my previous views and convictions, and thus save myself the pain of sundering my ecclesiastical ties. That review and reëxamination have been thoughtfully and prayerfully made; and the result has been a complete change on the subject of Christian Polity. What I formerly regarded as purely an ecclesiastical assumption, I now regard as *divine truth*, bearing the broad seal of CHRIST's authority. With my changed views, the next step was plain and *imperative*. I could not consistently and conscientiously minister in a Church whose polity I could not approve or defend. This will sufficiently account for my course this day.

S. R. WRIGHT.

This is a remarkable statement. And yet not remarkable; for there are hundreds on hundreds of our Clergy, who can sympathize with every word of our deceased brother. If the whole story could be written, of the inward struggles, the forcings and demands of conscience, the expostulations and tears of friends, the threats, and reproaches, and accusations, of those whose hearts have been wounded, or whose sectarian pride has been crossed, if the record of all this could be spread before the Church, it would make a volume stranger than any fiction which has ever been written. But the secret of such history is locked up for the disclosures of the great, awful day, save as, now and then, a tale is told like that which Mr. Wright has here spread before us. But we cannot help saying, that the Church, which such men sacrifice so much to enter, is something more, at least in their apprehension, than a mongrel collection of mushroom, warring Sects, Creedless and Faithless, believing anything, or believing nothing.

Mr. Wright was confirmed in the Church of the Holy Cross, in Uniontown, Ala., on the thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, 1853. He was ordained Deacon in the same place, May 9th, 1854; and Priest, in St. Paul's Church, Selma, Ala., October 10th, of the same year. All these official acts were administered by the venerable Rt. Rev. N. H. COBBS, D. D., Bishop of Alabama.

In the summer of 1854, the deceased accepted the appointment of Rector of Christ Church, Matagorda, Texas; and he was already making arrangements to leave Alabama, when he received letters from the Vestry, informing him that their Church edifice had been entirely destroyed by the disastrous storm which swept Matagorda, in September of that year, and proposing to release him from his engagement. The

course which he then determined to pursue was eminently characteristic of the man.

Although, in the general gloom, which hung like a pall over the community, in consequence of the almost entire destruction of the city, his congregation despaired of rebuilding their Church and released him from his obligations to take charge of them; and, although in leaving Alabama, where he had spent the best portion of his life, he was sacrificing his interest and severing ties which were hallowed by long-cherished friendships and time-honored associations, still duty, the polar star, that had guided his actions through life, determined his course then. He immediately informed his congregation, that since in their prosperity they had selected him, as their Minister, in the hour of their adversity, he would not desert them. Accordingly, the deceased removed, in a few months, to *Mata-gorda*; and until the day of his death his thoughts and energies were chiefly directed to the reestablishment and extension of his Church. Of his constant and untiring exertions to attain his object, of the hardships and privations he encountered, and the sufferings he endured, when the hand of disease fell upon him, in a far distant city, while pursuing his long and weary pilgrimage, to solicit aid in the accomplishment of his cherished design, it is unnecessary to speak. In Boston, where he was struck down with partial paralysis, in New Haven, in-New York, and Philadelphia, he won the respect and sympathy of warm friends, and enlisted efficient aid in the work to which he had given himself, and in which, as it proved, he sacrificed his life. One who knew him well, on his visit to the North, says, "We saw a great deal of Mr. Wright during his stay here, and became much interested in him and his work. While among us he gained many friends, and left with all the impression of his most attractive Christian character. He was an eloquent preacher, because he was so simple, so earnest, so full of sanctified humanity. In his private intercourse here he will be long remembered. He was a man so Christ-like as not to be forgotten. His gentleness, his flowing and generous sympathies, won affection and confidence from all. We know that his loss must be deeply deplored and long felt by his parishioners and the Diocese. His account of his personal trials and sufferings, which never went beyond the private ear, could not fail to impress one with the sincerity and goodness of his life; all told, too, with the never failing smile of hope and faith. He was an example to many of us who, with our lesser causes of trouble, are prone to magnify them, and act as if we had lost

all faith and hope. He was really one of those 'servants who have departed this life in His faith and fear,' whose 'good example,' let us hope, we may have 'grace to follow.'"

As to the object of his visit to the North,—suffice it to say, that his labors were crowned with success and that, ere death had closed his earthly career, he enjoyed the consolation of knowing, that, through his instrumentality, the beautiful temple which had crumbled into fragments, in the ruthless tempest, would soon be restored. And when its ample material shall rise into form and proportion and shall be dedicated to that cause, which the deceased held so dear—it will, from the nature of its design, be a monument to his memory more honorable and glorious, than were the proudest mausoleums of old to the memories of the departed heroes of heathen times. The great cause of education, in which, by far the larger portion of the life of the deceased had been engaged, occupied, emphatically, the second place in his thoughts and affections. He regarded education as the handmaid of religion, believing that the proper intellectual and moral training of the young constituted the ground-work in the great scheme for the extermination of vice and the promotion of virtue. It was the lot of the deceased, in his long and arduous career as a teacher, to shape the minds and character of a very large number of individuals, and his success in, perhaps, the most responsible of human occupations, was such as but few have enjoyed. In the character of the deceased were beautifully blended the moral, intellectual and social qualities of our nature. Possessing a mind of rare natural endowments, which had been enlarged and cultivated by severe study and reflection, he was a stranger alike to arrogance and ostentation; but modest, quiet, and unassuming in his opinions and actions, he was evidently unconscious of the extent of his intellectual capacities.

The death of Mr. Wright was very sudden and unexpected. He had been summoned, on the morning of the 28th of January last, to perform the last offices of the Church for a deceased citizen; and, while actually on his way for that purpose, a renewal of the shock which had previously alarmed his friends, immediately prostrated him, and he instantaneously expired. And yet, thank God, such men do not, cannot die. In Paradise they commence a more glorious existence, waiting in peaceful hope the joyful resurrection of the just.

His departure, so striking in its suddenness and manner, shrouded the city in gloom. All were mourners. For all had lost a friend. So deep was the impression on the community, that the routine of business was suspended, and stores were

closed for the day. At his Funeral the Masonic Lodge of the county, comprising many of the most influential citizens, paid such a tribute to his rare worth as is deserved by few. They speak of him as one who was ever "found a warm friend and a faithful monitor; that his precepts and examples were sure guides in the paths of virtue. Erudite and profound in his mental acquirements, gentlemanly and urbane in his intercourse, unflinching in his admonition when required; he was a man to mould the mind and character for good, a man to purify the social and moral atmosphere of this community. One whom all could love and respect, and whose memory we shall consider it a privilege to cherish so long as our earthly lodge shall exist."

The Church needs more of such true and whole-hearted men, on our distant frontiers. The Church needs, alas! still more, such true and valiant men, to control and direct public sentiment at our strong posts of influence at home—men of great practical wisdom, and yet! who are men indeed, and not time-serving sycophants—men, not forever courting notoriety, but *daring* to be unknown and forgotten, if so be, they may follow Him Who was "despised and rejected," a Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief"—men valiant for the "Truth as it is in Jesus," rather than for the truth as it is in Science, and yet who have drank deeply of the mysteries of both—men, who see something in the Church to live for, "besides the loaves and fishes," and the Mitre which they forfeit and should always lose who seek it; for, in seeking after it, they show how unworthy they are to obtain it—men, more than ready, if need be, to suffer and to die, "for His Body's sake which is the Church"—men, who wear the Cross, not as a flaunting ornament of the outward apparel, but engraven deeply on the life, the affections, the will, on human pride, and worldly ambition; and where holy angels watch over, and guard it, as a sure pledge of the promised Crown.



## ART. V.—THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.

*An Exegesis of 1 Peter iii, 18–20.*

THE passage which we propose to examine is one which, probably, most persons read without any very definite idea of its meaning. And those who may be disposed to consult the Commentators, will find their own difficulties often increased by the variety of interpretations which they there meet. There are few, even of the unlearned readers of the Scriptures, who have not felt a desire to understand the passage, standing, as it does, in the midst of the short and earnest Epistles of St. Peter, which have always been a favorite portion of the Bible in the readings of the devout; while the fact, that the passage is selected as one of our Epistles—the Epistle for Easter Even—gives it an additional claim upon our attention. We will try to present a careful analysis of its sense.

“For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water.”

There are two principal interpretations of the passage, to which Commentators on the one side or on the other incline, even with all their diversity of criticism as to minor points connected with its phraseology.

One of these two views is that St. Peter here reveals, that our Lord did, in the interval between His death and His resurrection, and while His body lay in the grave, go, in His human soul, to the penitent Antediluvians—here spoken of as the “spirits in prison”—in the place of departed spirits, and there proclaim to them the results of His work of Atonement for their comfort and joy. This view is ably sustained by Bishop Horsley, who is its chief defender, and, after him, (we think, mainly and too easily, from deference to his opinion,) is supported by Mr. Slade and Dr. Bloomfield, and by Bishop Hobart of our country; and under the authority of these great names, is received by many without further investigation.

The other view of the two referred to, is that which supposes St. Peter to affirm, that our Lord, as the Son, or Word,

the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity, did, with His Divine or superior nature or Spirit (that which was never affected by death, even when His human body and soul were subjected to the common course of mortality) preach, through and with Noah, during the hundred and twenty years while the ark was being builded, to the Antediluvian world, to call them to repentance; and that the Apostle simply refers to or describes those disobedient persons then rejecting the calls to repentance, as being now (i. e. when he wrote) "the spirits in prison." This view does not suppose the passage to have any reference to our Saviour's visit, in His human soul, to the state of the dead; while those holding this view may fully believe, as we do, from other Scriptures, in the Hades or Sheol, or place of departed spirits, intermediate between death and the Resurrection to the Judgment. This view does not regard this passage as a proof-text for the doctrine of the intermediate state, except so far as the single phrase "spirits in prison" separated from the rest of the passage may bear upon that doctrine. This view (to cite a few distinguished names) is maintained, so far as denying that this passage proves Christ's preaching to the Antediluvians in Hades, by Whitby, Burnet, Scott, Macknight and Townsend, who expound the Spirit by which Christ was quickened and preached as the Holy Spirit, the Third Person in the Blessed Trinity, giving what seems to be the sense of our received version, wherein the word "Spirit" is here printed with a capital to denote the Holy Ghost. This view is also maintained, in the very form in which we have stated it, by two greater names, Beza and Archbishop Pearson. The words of Beza are: "*ex diluvii historia liquet, Christus is est qui temporibus illis quum Deus patientissimus terminum ad resipiscendum mundo definisset, adfuit, non quidem corporali præsentia, sed divina illa sua virtute, prædicans resipiscientiam, per os videlicet ipsius Noe arcam apparantis, spiritibus illis immorigeris, qui nunc in carcere servantur, plenam suæ rebellionis mercedem expectantes,*" &c. The words of Archbishop Pearson are equally explicit: "The spirit by which he is said to preach, was not the soul of Christ, but that Spirit by which he was quickened; as appeareth by the coherence of the words. Now that Spirit by which Christ was quickened is that by which he was raised from the dead, that is, *the power of His Divinity*, as St. Paul expresseth it, 'Though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God;' in respect of which he preached to those which were disobedient in the days of Noah." Our own convictions incline us to this latter view.

It may be proper to state, that the former of the two views here presented was held by some of the early Reformers of the Church of England in the sixteenth century,\* and was incorporated at first in the Articles of Religion, in the Catechism of Edward the Sixth, and in the metrical version of the Creed; but their views seem to have soon changed, and this passage of St. Peter was withdrawn as a proof-text. Bishop Horsley very candidly states some of the particulars: "In the Articles of Religion agreed upon in Convocation in the year 1552, the sixth, of Edward the Sixth, and published by the King's authority the year following, the third Article is in these words: 'As Christ died and was buried for us, so also it is to be believed that He went down into hell: For the body lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection; but His ghost (or soul) departing from Him was with the ghosts that were in prison, or in hell; as the place of St. Peter doth testify.' But in the short interval of ten years, between this Convocation in the reign of Edward and the setting forth of the Thirty-nine Articles in their present form, in the fifth of Queen Elizabeth, a change seems to have taken place in the opinions of the divines of our Church with respect to this text of St. Peter. For, in the Articles, as they were then drawn, and we now have them, Christ's descent into hell is still asserted; but the proof of it from the text of St. Peter is withdrawn, as if the literal sense of the text which affords the proof had fallen under suspicion, and some other exposition of it had been adopted." Archbishop Pearson even more fully states the facts in regard to this change of opinion among the English Reformers. The evidence from these facts of history is, that our Church, although fully believing in the doctrine, as proved by other Scriptures, that the human soul of Christ did go into Hades or the state of departed spirits, while His body lay in the grave, yet does not rely upon this passage of St. Peter as a proof-text

---

\* We must admit, too, that many of the early fathers maintained this former interpretation, as Hermes, Irenæus, Clemens Alexander, Origen, Athanasius, Epiphanius. At the same time most of these held the fanciful idea that Hades was in the lowest parts of the material earth, and quoted to sustain this idea Ephesians iv, 9: "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" The absurdity of this interpretation throws discredit upon their exposition of St. Peter. But St. Augustine, the giant of the earlier Church, rejects the prevailing view of his times, and declares the sense of St. Peter to be unsettled, and denies the application of this passage to Christ's Descent into Hell. His language is: "*Considera tamen, ne forte totum illud, quod de conclusis in carcere spiritibus qui in diebus Noe non crediderant Petrus Apostolus dicit, omnino ad inferos non pertineat, sed ad illa potius tempora quorum formam, (i. e. exemplum, analogiam,) ad hæc tempora transtulit.*" [See Pearson on the Creed.]

in favor of that doctrine. This decision of the Church we regard as based upon a sound exegesis, and we will endeavor to show that there are reasons to sustain it.

We will take up the passage clause by clause, as this is the most convenient method in which to examine it.

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God." St. Peter was exhorting the persecuted Christians to bear their trials with patience and submission; and in order to encourage them in this Christian fortitude, adduced, in the clause quoted, the example of our Redeemer. This clause we do not comment on, since it is here quoted simply to introduce us to the contested passage which follows in its direct grammatical connection with this.

"Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." The prepositions "in" and "by" in this sentence are not in the original—*θανάτωσις μὲν σαρκί, ζωοποιήσις δὲ [τῷ] πνεύματι*. The passage, as all critics are agreed, is one of simple antithesis or contrast. Whatever preposition the translator puts before the one noun, he must put the same before the other noun; the perfection of the antithesis makes this absolutely indispensable. If we use the preposition "by," as denoting instrumental agency, before the word "the spirit," we must also use it in the same sense before the word "the flesh;" and this would give an absurd sense. We must find another preposition, that shall furnish a good sense, while common to both clauses. The sentence should read: "Being put to death, (or dead,) *in or as to* the flesh, but quickened (or alive) *in or as to* the spirit." The "flesh" and the "spirit" of Christ are here contrasted in respect of their condition.\*

If we had this sentence alone, and no others with which to compare it, we might be in doubt as to the exact meaning of these two phrases. But, in God's good Providence, which has provided aids for us in the study of His word, there is a pas-

---

\* The Syriac Version admirably preserves the antithesis: "He died in body but lived in spirit." (Murdock's Translation.) But we must confess, that the Syriac translates or paraphrases, according to Bishop Horsley's theory. Yet this was to be expected from the prevailing view at the time when this Version was prepared, as illustrated in a former note. The whole passage reads, in Dr. Murdock's translation, thus: "And he died in body, but lived in spirit. And he preached to those souls which were detained in Hades, which were formerly disobedient in the days of Noah, when the long suffering of God commanded an ark to be made in hope of their repentance; and eight souls only entered into it, and were kept alive in the waters. And ye also, by a like figure, are made alive by baptism, (not when ye wash your bodies from filth, but when ye confess God with a pure conscience,) and by the resurrection of Jesus the Messiah."

sage precisely analogous to this, in the Epistle to the Romans, which throws strong light upon the meaning of St. Peter. It is in the opening verses of the Epistle: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle, separated unto the Gospel of God, which he had promised afore by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." (Rom. i, 1-4.) In this passage, as in that of St. Peter, the phrases "according to the flesh," and "according to the Spirit of holiness," are an antithesis. Both relate to Christ—one to His human nature, and the other to His contrasted and Higher nature. The passage in the Romans should be: "Who was made of the seed (i. e. the Son) of David according to the flesh, (i. e. as to His whole and perfect human nature, both of body and soul, for it means His entire Incarnation,) and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness, (i. e. as to His Holy and Divine Spiritual nature, that nature which is altogether contrasted with His human, the Eternal Sonship, the Almighty Word or Logos,) by the resurrection from the dead." Our translators, in both of these passages—this of the Romans and this of St. Peter—render the word "Spirit," as if it meant the Holy Spirit, the Third person in the glorious Trinity; thus, in each case, overlooking and destroying the perfect and powerful antithesis intended by the sacred writers. In each of these passages, as most Commentators are agreed, these opposite clauses refer to the two contrasted natures of Christ, in the one of which He is the Son of God, and in the other the Son of man—the one Divine, the other human. This passage from the Epistle to the Romans illustrates exactly the distinction in that from St. Peter. The two are precisely parallel. In each there is an antithesis between the human nature of Christ and His Divine nature—between Him, as the Son of man both in His human body and soul, and as the Son of God in His Divine, Filial Relation, the Only-Begotten before and above all angels, the Creator, the Word or Logos, which was in the beginning with God.

To confirm the interpretation which we have given, we will refer, in a rapid way, to several other passages which show, that, by the New Testament usage, the phrase "the flesh" is continually used to designate not the body alone, but the entire human nature both in body and soul. In the eighth Chapter to the Romans, and frequently elsewhere, the word "flesh" is

used to describe the evil nature in opposition to the spirit, and is spoken of as having "mind" and "wills," thus denoting man's moral and immaterial nature, as well as his physical. But the term is frequently applied to Christ in particular, as signifying His whole Humanity, not His body only, but His body and soul. Wherever it is applied to Him, it has this sense—we recall no exception. In the second Chapter of the Acts, at the thirtieth verse, Peter says of David, that God had sworn to him, "that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh (i. e. as in His Incarnation, as a living man with body and soul) he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." In the ninth of Romans, St. Paul writes of the Jews thus: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh (i. e. in His entire human nature, His Incarnation) Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever," (ix, 5.) In his first Epistle to Timothy, (iii, 16,) St. Paul declares: "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in the flesh," i. e. manifested in the whole human nature, referring to the Incarnation. And, to adduce one other passage, St. John, in the first Chapter of his Gospel, (verse 14,) writes: "The Word was made flesh (i. e. a man, Incarnate, having the *whole* human nature in body and soul) and dwelt among us." Passages like these might be multiplied, but these are sufficient to show that the phrase "put to death in the flesh" is equivalent to "put to death as to His human nature, as He was a perfect man"—that by this is meant not merely the death of the body of Christ, but that change, whatever it be, which passes upon the entire man, as to the conditions and relations both of body and soul, in the act of death.

The point, that by the phrase "the flesh" as here used in contradistinction from "the spirit," is meant the whole human nature of Christ, both body and soul, is very important, is *vital*, in this discussion, since Bishop Horsley and those with him suppose it to mean only *the body* of Christ, understanding the contrasted phrase "the spirit" to mean only His *human soul*, and not His Divine and Superior Nature. Our arguments prove both these suppositions to be untenable and merely fanciful; while a rigid induction of the sense of the words, and the necessary construction from the nature of the antithesis, and the usage ascertained from the analogous passage in the Epistle to the Romans proves the interpretation of Bishop Horsley to be incorrect and in violation of the laws of a sound exegesis.

The rest of the passage now follows:

"By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long



suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water."

"By which"—the relative in the first of these clauses (*ἐν ᾧ*, the neuter pronoun) refers to its (neuter) antecedent, "the spirit," in which Christ was quickened or alive, that is, His superior and Divine nature which was not affected by His death in the flesh or in His human nature; so that the clause means, "by which Divine nature He went and preached," &c.

We may remark, that our Translators, in their effort, generally so admirably executed, to make their version as literal as possible, have in some cases obscured the sense. In the original, the connection between the different clauses of a sentence, however widely separated these clauses may be, is always defined by the great variety of forms which distinguish cases, genders, moods, tenses, numbers, persons, &c. In our language of few oblique forms, such a separation may seem to connect clauses which are not connected in sense. Thus in this passage of St. Peter, where the clauses are arranged just as they stand in the original, the phrase "in the days of Noah" qualifies the expression which it immediately follows: "when once the long suffering of God waited;" whereas, in the construction of the original, it may follow the phrase "went and preached" quite as appropriately as it now follows the other phrase in our Translation. And, if it were read in this connection, the sense would be clearer: "by which spiritual Divine nature He went and preached, in the days of Noah, to the spirits (now) in prison, who were sometime (or formerly) disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited, while the ark was a preparing," &c.

The view, which we maintain, is that Christ preached to the disobedient Antediluvians, in the days of Noah, *with* and *through* the patriarch.

He preached *with* Noah. Turning to the sixth chapter of Genesis, which gives the history of the times of Noah, we read, in the third verse: "And the Lord (Jehovah) said, my spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." This last clause, as the annotators generally are agreed, means that one hundred and twenty years were still assigned for the opportunity of repentance and reformation before the time fixed for the threatened flood. Now remember, that wherever in the Old Testament the Lord (Jehovah) is represented as *speaking* to men, as *saying* or *doing* anything, audibly or visibly, by any external manifestation to the senses of men, in all such

cases, without exception, the JEHOVAH-ANGEL or Christ is always meant. Wherever God has been manifested, it has been through His Son, the Word, the "Angel of the Lord" (i. e. the Angel-Jehovah or the Jehovah-Angel) from the days of Adam to the close of the world. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only Begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him," (John i, 18.) Keeping in remembrance this great principle, which certainly all Church critics allow, compare this statement in Genesis: "The Lord said, my spirit shall not always strive with man"—i. e. His spirit, which had been striving, and would still persevere to strive, through the 120 years until the Deluge; compare this with the statement of St. Peter: "by which spirit he went and preached, in the days of Noah, to the spirits (now) in prison," i. e. to the Antediluvians, and we see at once the propriety of Christ's being spoken of as preaching in the days of Noah, even directly and personally, in His manifestations as the Jehovah-Angel. The same thought is suggested by the peculiar expression applied to Noah, in common with Enoch, that "he *walked* with God," that is, had intimate and constant communion with Him, in His visible manifestations. Thus Christ preached in His manifestations.

But he preached also *through* Noah. The brief account in Genesis shows that Noah and his family were the only righteous ones then on the earth. "And God looked upon the earth, and behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the Earth. And God said unto Noah, the end of all flesh is come before me, for the earth is filled with violence through them; and behold, I will destroy them with the Earth." (Gen. vi, 12, 13.) In connection with this picture of universal corruption, it is said: "But Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord." (Verse 8.) And again: "The Lord said unto Noah, come thou, and all thy house, into the ark; for thee (i. e. thee only) have I seen righteous before me in this generation." (Gen. vii, 1.) St. Peter, in his 2nd Epistle, (ii, 5,) says: "God spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." These several passages show us that Noah was the only one, with his house, of all that generation, who was righteous, and that he preached to the wicked world around him, but in vain. This accords with the statement of the writer to the Hebrews: "By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by

faith." (Heb. xi, 7.) Our Lord's description is to the same purport: "For, as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, *until* the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away." (St. Matt. xxiv, 38, 39.) All these passages go to show—the whole of this history shows—that Noah and his house alone were righteous, and faithfully preached repentance; but that all the rest of the world were alike impenitent and hardened. Thus Christ preached, by His personal Teachings and by His Inspirations, through the patriarch, who officiated as His commissioned "preacher of righteousness."

"He went and preached." This peculiar phrase confirms the view that Christ is spoken of in the passage before us, as actually preaching in the days of Noah. Strictly, from the original, (*ἐν ᾧ . . . πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους*) this should be rendered: "by which spirit having gone—i. e. in time past—he preached." This may apply as well to the days of Noah as to the time of Christ's Burial. The Syriac version translates simply: "he preached." (Murdock's Translation.) And Macknight writes this able note: "Elsner, on this passage, hath produced examples from the Scriptures, and from Demosthenes, to show that the phrase 'he went and preached' is a pleonasm for 'he preached.'" Among the examples from Scripture, the clearest and most direct is Eph. ii, 15, &c. "Having abolished, &c., and came and preached peace to you who were afar off, and to them who were nigh." For it is certain that our Lord, after his resurrection, did not go personally to the Gentiles to preach peace to them; he preached to them by his Apostles only. But if Christ is said by Paul to go and do, what he did by his Apostles, he may with equal propriety be said by Peter *to go and do*, what he did by his prophet Noah." The foregoing note satisfactorily disposes of any objection to our view, founded upon the word "went," as implying the necessity of Christ's personal presence with those to whom He preached.

The word "preached," too, bears forcibly upon the argument. Bishop Horsley, and those with him, interpret this word as meaning simply to proclaim the glad tidings of redemption to those already penitent and saved. Now this, we believe, is entirely at variance with the constant usage of the word in the New Testament. There is *not*, that we can recollect, *a single passage* in which the word (especially without an object, as in St. Peter) has so limited a meaning. "They went forth and preached everywhere that men should repent," (St. Mark xvi, 20,) is the declaration concerning the *preaching*

of the Apostles. To *preach*, was to proclaim not only the Author of Salvation, but the conditions of securing salvation by repentance, &c. St. Mark, describing our Saviour's own preaching, says: "Jesus came into Galilee *preaching* the Gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand. Repent ye, and believe the Gospel." (i, 14, 15.) There is nothing in the passage of St. Peter which limits the usual sense of the word "preached" to only a part of its idea. Christ's preaching was to repentance, when He was incarnate. Christ's preaching, through His prophets of old, and His Apostles of later days, was to repentance. What single reason is there to suppose that His preaching ever was or can be of a different sort? The fixed sense of the word "preached," is fatal to Bishop Horsley's interpretation.

Besides, to deviate a moment from the line of strict exegesis, this fancy of preaching to the dead is something which certainly has no support in any other part of Scripture, and cannot, therefore, properly be hence deduced. And, if our Saviour proclaimed his Gospel in Hades, why to the penitent Antediluvians, (and to only the last generation of these,) rather than to all the saints who had entered the state of the dead in the ages (as well after as before the deluge) prior to His Incarnation? And is there in Paradise—that part of the place of departed spirits, where the good anticipate their perfect consummation and bliss—a separate place for the Antediluvians, and another for the Postdiluvians? Is there not something like the old fancy of the *Limbus Patrum*—and this subdivided—involved in the theory we oppose? Not only is this theory utterly inconsistent with a careful Biblical Criticism, it, also, surrounds itself with insuperable difficulties of *Doctrine and Faith*.

"The spirits in prison."\* About the word "spirits," there is no discussion. It means, as all agree, the souls or immortal part of those who had perished in the flood of Noah. But as to the other word "prison," there has been an interpretation given which is utterly contrary to the whole usage of the Scriptures. Bishop Horsley, to carry out his exposition, is obliged to give to this word a meaning the very opposite from that which it everywhere else bears. The meaning of the word is fixed to denote a prison or place of confinement for criminal or

\* Some have explained this phrase as wholly metaphorical, denoting the Gentiles in the captivity of sin—prisoners to vice and lust, as in Isaiah xlii, 7; xlix, 9; lxi, 1. But such an interpretation of *this* passage is hardly worthy to be mentioned.

condemned or suspected persons. But if this be its sense here, as everywhere else, it sweeps away his theory, because the spirits in the prison of condemnation could not, as he admits, be interested in the tidings of salvation. Therefore he invents a meaning for the word (*φυλακή*) which we translate "prison," founded upon a primary sense of the verb from which it is derived, and calls it a "place of safe-keeping," thus making this "prison" to represent Paradise, or the State of the Holy dead, to which the human soul of Christ went after His crucifixion and prior to His Resurrection. In this way, when the word *βαπτίζω* had established, in the course of ages, its secondary sense to "wash," Mr. Carson, to sustain a theory, rejects this established sense and substitutes for it the primary meaning of the word and its ancient root. In this way, any theory may be sustained, and the Scripture may be made to teach anything. Even great minds are often tempted to strange absurdities, in their over-ardent zeal to establish some favorite opinion. In this manner the learned prelate has completely subverted the established meaning of the word *φυλακή* as a place for the wicked, and condemned to a precisely opposite sense as a place for the good and saved. Numerous examples might be adduced of the true sense of the word, to sustain our Received Version, did time permit, and to show that the "prison" of St. Peter here is the same place referred to by St. Jude, as that where the fallen angels are "reserved in chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day," (vs. 6.)

Calvin, who supposed this passage of St. Peter to refer to our Saviour's going into the state of the dead, while His body was buried, feeling the force, and acknowledging the true meaning, of this word "prison," is more consistent; and although the supposition was awful, yet he faced it honestly, and supposed that our Lord in His spirit and soul, spent the three days while His body lay in the grave, in the Gehenna or hell of torment, working out there the full condemnation and literal torments of the lost in the prison of despair. Yet this view of Calvin, founded upon an erroneous interpretation of this passage of St. Peter, has no support from any other portion of the Word of God.

"Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited," &c. Bishop Horsley supposes the spirits in prison who are further described in this clause "which sometime," &c., to be those who having been disobedient for a time repented at the preaching of Noah, and were then drowned in the flood along with the wicked world; and that to these Christ

went for their comfort. He renders the phrase "sometime were" into "one while had been disobedient," implying "that they were recovered from that disobedience, and before their death had been brought to repentance and faith in the Redeemer to come." (Sermon.) But, apart from all our previous reasons, the adverb properly translated "sometime," (ποτε,) in the clause "which were sometime disobedient," means simply "formerly, (which is a synonym of "sometime,") in the absolute and unlimited sense, and never, as Bishop Horsley translates it, "for a time" or "for one while," equivalent to temporarily." There is no other passage where it has such a sense, in the New Testament. The learned writer has strained a point of criticism altogether too far, in this case, as in the others, in order to sustain his favorite interpretation. The phrase "once waited" in this clause comes from the common reading ἀπαξ ἐξεδέχετο which our translators had before them; and if this were the true reading, the phrase could have no effect upon the interpretation, since the "once" ἀπαξ (meaning a single time, or once for all, or formerly) would be only pleonastic and unnecessary in the sense. But the Editors of the Greek New Testament almost universally decide, from the MSS. and from the evidence both external and internal, that the true reading should be ἀπεξεδέχετο, a compound from ἀπο not ἀπαξ, which signifies "long and anxiously waited." (See Bloomfield.) The true sense of this clause, then, is, "which were disobedient formerly, when (ποτε, ὅτε, correlatives, formerly, when, i. e., at a certain former time, during which said time) the long suffering of God long and anxiously waited," &c. The idea is, that these persons continued disobedient as long as the patience of God waited, and until His patience was exhausted.

The true sense, then, of the whole of this remarkable passage may perhaps be summed up as follows: "Christ was put to death or died, in the flesh, as to His whole human nature, His body going into the grave, and His human soul going to Paradise, where the souls of the good wait in joyful hope for the Resurrection to Life. But He remained alive or quick, and altogether unaffected by death, in His superior spirit, as to His Divine nature, by which, also, in the days of Noah, with and through that preacher of righteousness, He having then gone to them, preached to the spirits who are now in the prison of condemnation, but which were disobedient formerly, when and while the long suffering of God anxiously waited, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure or antitype to which water,



(the relative *ὃς* in the neuter referring to its neuter antecedent *ἡ βαπτισμα*.) even Baptism, doth also now save us," &c.

One question remains to be answered: Why did St. Peter allude to the saving of Noah and his family particularly, and to Christ's preaching to that particular generation of the impenitent world in the days of Noah? We answer, because the allusion was naturally suggested by the association of ideas. He was thinking, and had been speaking, through the chapter, of the persecutions of the Christians, in the midst of the great world of their enemies, the wicked, and exhorting them to patience, (vs. 9-17.) Here he introduces the example of Christ, who suffered even to death, (vs. 18,) and who was raised again and crowned with triumph, and who reigns to support and to reward with glory His faithful confessors, (vss. 18, 21, 22, the same subject also immediately continued in the next chapter iv, 1, 2, 13, 14, further referred to, at v, 4, 9-10.) This one great prominent thought of their making, in the face of all oppositions, a conscientious and persevering confession of Christ, (animated by His past example, His present exalted protection, and His future rewards,) is represented and embodied, to the mind of the Apostle, in their Baptism, as he describes it, (vs. 21.) This true Baptism, witnessing and expressing this faithful confession, will save them in their day, ("doth also now save us,") just as the typical waters of the deluge saved the faithful Noah and his family out of the world of the wicked, which wicked world then in Noah's day, rejected Christ's preaching, just as the later wicked world, in which these Christians were suffering and testifying, rejected Him. Thus the association of ideas is perfectly natural and easy. He refers to Christ's suffering and death in the flesh. This suggests Christ's living in the Spirit. This, (as the confession, the Baptism, associating with it the typical waters of the deluge, were prominent in his mind,) suggested Christ's preaching to the disobedient in Noah's day, and connected with this, the saving of Noah and his family on the typical waters. From this, the association of the Christian Baptism and confession was directly reached; and from this, Christ's Resurrection and power and rewards readily followed. The great idea in the mind of St. Peter here, was the true and faithful confession, the subjective qualification for, and formally expressed on our part in, our Baptism; this Baptism also, suggesting and illustrated by the salvation of the few faithful confessors by the typical water of the Deluge. The reference to Christ's preaching to the spirits then disobedient and now in prison was made only incidentally, and as serving to introduce the more prominent thought which followed.

We trust that our argument will not be unwelcome to the sincere lover and student of the Word of God. We are reminded that there is in the other world a "prison;" where the spirits of the disobedient and impenitent of all ages, from the days before the flood to the end of time, are reserved for the judgment to come. May we beware of the neglect of duty, and be warned of the consequences of disobedience to the messengers of God! We are reminded, too, of the fact, that Christ, the Son of God, the Redeemer of men, is always preaching to the living generations of men. He preached in the days of old. He preaches in our days. By His Ministers and by His Holy Spirit, His preaching is, "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel." May we hear and obey Him! We are reminded, too, of the glorious privileges of our Christian Baptism, and of the "answer of a good conscience," that saves us. May we be true and persevering, and obtain the great salvation!

## ART. VI.—DISSENSIONS IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

No. II.—*Gnosticism.*

WE turn now from the Judaizing movement of the Apostolic Age to another, traces of which, indeed, are discernible in the lifetime of St. Paul, although it did not culminate until towards the middle of the second Century. This Movement, which has been the plague and confusion of students in Church History, (for who has not been put to his wits end in his first encounters with Gnosticism,) has within the last fifty years received masterly treatment and analysis; although all the difficulties of it have by no means been cleared. Many of them inhere in the nature of the subject itself; and must, therefore, continue in spite of all *critiques*. Still, difficulties or no difficulties, the study of Gnosticism will repay every one who undertakes it, inasmuch as a phase of the old civilization and a type of theorizing are brought to light which we do not encounter fairly in the ordinary Histories.

It is hard to produce much effect in a picture with a dark background, especially when the light in the foreground is far from brilliant, when no halo or splendor of any sort gathers around the prominent figures. Gnosticism lacks dramatic interest. Few, save men addicted to the study of Philosophy or Theology, will care to undertake an investigation into a subject or period where the play of human passion, of fears and hopes, of joys and sorrows, is not seen in any distinctness—where the men whose names are mentioned, are only names, by means of which we distinguish one form of the general movement from another. We encounter here, an extraordinary form of speculative thought, but not rich, diversified action—an attempt to solve the mystery of the world in a style which even now awakens our wonder, but not systematic effort directed towards concrete, tangible good; we come face to face with a theosophic speculation, which few now would like either to imitate or reproduce, though the informing spirit of it may live in our own time.

We do not, of course, propose to write the History of Gnosticism. It will be our endeavor to set forth its leading characteristic principles and the grounds of the varieties of its development, as well as to show its real relations to Christianity and the Church. In order to understand or enter into it at all, it

will, perhaps, be necessary for us to unlearn some things, and to give our attention to phases, and combinations of life which will tend to modify our general notion respecting the state of the religious belief and thought of the world at the beginning of the Christian Era. For has it not been our habit in the study of this period to view men, nations, movements, literatures, philosophies, faiths, in themselves simply, and without any thought of the possible influence which they might exert over each other, or of the existence of mutual relations among them? We speak of Greek thought and philosophy as lingering around Athens and finding culture in the colonies and cities of Greek origin; of Indian thought as having settled into the repose of death under the shadows of the Himalayas; of Judaism as stiff and inflexible in its adherence to its traditions, mistaking its own meaning; of Rome, as bent only and ever upon conquest and glory, and thus, we leave the matter, complacently thinking we have studied "the times" in question, when, in fact, we have only gathered together the isolated factors and ingredients of the time. We read Greek classics and find in them especially an expression of the Greek mind—we read the Scriptures of the Old Testament and find them not only intensely national, but opposed to the world around, lying in darkness; we discern a great gulf between the two, and we infer that each continued to stand apart, that between Jew and Greek there were no points of spiritual contact, much less sympathy. In this way, our notions become stiff, formal, unhistorical. They lack the flavor of life. We may know what Hydrogen is and what Oxygen is, but can we, therefore, be said to know the properties of water? The combination of factors produces new agents and powers; and it is our business to seek at least a knowledge of the relations, of the acting and counteracting influences of men and faiths and forms of thought upon one another, and in their commingled action to learn the real character of the Age.

The conquests of Alexander mark an Era in the History of the old World. That romantic and extraordinary character left Colonies behind him, in Asia Minor, in Syria,—on the confines of Asia and in Egypt. These Colonies growing in wealth and importance, became the means of spreading the Greek Language and Literature, just as the English Colonists of North America in peopling a new world, brought with them the Language and Literature of the Mother Country. The Greek Colonists, however, caught the rays of Eastern thought, and reflected them through the refined medium of their own understandings, as Venice has over it a blush of the Orient, although it belongs to Italy. Subsequently Rome laid her hands upon

these Greek Colonies, and pushing her conquests in all directions, became the one controlling power of the World. Great highways serving alike for the march of the Legions to and from Rome, and also for exports and imports, developed a taste for wandering and travel. The conveniences of locomotion in those days may be inferred from the fact that the bay of Naples was fringed with villas which were the country seats of rich Romans. The enormous wealth of Rome developed, of course, new events, and a taste for foreign luxuries. The East began to pour her manifold products—her ivories, spices and silks—into the Metropolis. Her populations, likewise, began to move. With the merchants, with the slaves, astrologers also, soothsayers and magicians found their way to the West. The West began to attract the East, just as the East led captive the imagination of the West. All tongues and lands, and faiths, therefore, had their representatives in all the great cities of the world. In this way the East opened the mysteries of her speculative beliefs. The world's thought, in fact, was on the world's dusty highways to find circulation, to gather fresh Life by and under new combinations. Greek Philosophy, Oriental Theosophy, scepticism, superstition, despair, were all mingling and blending imperceptibly to themselves and affecting the minds of the world, none the less really because indefinitely. National genius expired with national life, and Rome, in her universal dominion rendered men and thought alike Cosmopolitan. Still, Rome herself gave birth to no new developments of thought. This was not her affair; it was her business to conquer and to rule.

It is necessary, therefore, to consider that quite apart from culture or life of the "classic" type, or of any pure type of historic thought, the world contained within itself a vast deal of floating speculative impulse, which had no fixed starting point, which proposed to itself no definite results, but which reflected in confused way, the varied products and characteristics of the nations that contributed to it. Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Greek Philosophy, each and all were in strange juxtaposition which argued that each had lost its life, and was seeking in the other or others a remedy for the defects of which it might feel itself conscious. The period exhibits all the phenomena of Transition—hereditary faiths yielding to the pressure of time, confusion, incertitude, unbelief, abandonment to pleasure, and proneness in the meanwhile to rely upon Magic. This last, which is a special characteristic of Ages that have lost their virtue, seems grounded in a feeling of helplessness over against Fate or the order of the world. And that this

had gained a mastery over the mind of the time, can no more be doubted than that beneath the gayeties of Paris at this moment slumbers despairing unbelief. What, therefore, was left for it? In its thoughts and theorizing it could not rise above its own level. At best it could but group and combine the materials within its reach, and in this style fashion its ideas of God and the world. In Alexandria, indeed, we observe marked distinct combinations of the Hellenic Mind with the Old Testament Theology. The Jews of that city were rich, influential and well educated. Their Greek culture, accordingly, manifested itself most clearly in the style in which they treated their own faith. The formal principle of the Alexandrian-Jewish theology was Platonism, while its material principle was the Law of Moses. Objectively, perhaps, the Law was one and the same thing to the Jew, whether of Egypt or of Judaea, but the modes of thought of the two were entirely distinct. The writings of Philo represent Alexandrian Judaism, and yet, such is the affinity between some of his speculations and those of given Gnostic sects, that it can readily be understood why Neander is so full and elaborate in his account of them. They are anticipations\* of Gnosticism, and Alexandria became one of the centres of Gnostic activity.

In Asia Minor, however, we behold combinations of materials different from that seen at Alexandria. The Philosophy of Greece—Platonism—associated itself not with Judaism, but with the Dualism of the East. Antioch, Ephesus, and other cities of less note, became more or less impregnated with Oriental Theosophizing. In so far as these places ceased to be Greek they were Oriental in their notions and ideas. But the tendency of the Orient was to express its ideas, in the form of symbols, of sensuous imagery. And these found their way into the Greek Worship. The Diana of Ephesus breathed an Oriental rather than a Greek spirit. She is not represented in the youthful form and the flowing drapery of the Hellenic Artemis. She is not the dashing attractive Huntress, but a sort of Panthea—is a multimamma, wrapped and swathed from her waist to her feet and covered over with symbolic representations. It being the tendency of the East to express its ideas by means of symbols and images, in so far as it would influence the Greek cities of Asia Minor and Syria, it would be in the sphere of worship and religious observances rather than of speculative thought. In this way the East struck its roots into Greek soil; on the

---

\* Baur demurs at the ground taken by Neander in the matter. He thinks that the *similarity* is pushed too far, &c., and gives good reason for his view



one hand making itself known in its own doctrines, especially its doctrine of the Evil of Matter, and on the other hand influencing Greek Worship itself.

In Egypt, then, we behold the combination of Hellenic Philosophy with Jewish theology, in Syria and Asia Minor the combination of Greek worship with Oriental symbolism—the latter connected of course with the Dualism which it sought to express. And here we have the constituent factors, the characteristic groupings of the spirit of this time, in the sphere of faith and philosophy, of symbol and worship. Greek thought and Judaism, Greek worship and Zoroastrianism are found clinging to, mingling with each other, and yet over all, broods restless incertitude. At last Christianity touched this chaotic confluence of beliefs and worships, and introduced into the world at once, the element and power of a new Life, and the principle destined to put an end to the old religions. These were found powerless to stay its course. It gathered its trophies from all classes and races of men; it had no regard for any existing faiths; it cared neither for the mythology of Greece nor the religion of Zoroaster. It had one fact to preach: and soon its plastic power began to be felt. It attracted and gathered multitudes into and within itself. It guarded and nourished them by ministries sent of Heaven. Under its inspiration, thieves, drunkards, prostitutes changed their lives; men burned costly books and implements of Magic; others mistaking its character sought the powers it could bestow, through offers of money. Together with those whom the Gospel changed, came others whom it did not change. It is one proof of the enormous energies of the Church that men joined her communion who were not of her, whether in their practice or in their opinions. From the confused mass of those who finding much that was attractive in Christianity yet did not come fully and fairly under its transforming power sprung the Gnostics—men for the most part given to the study of “the system of the world,” known in their day, according to Gibbon, “as the most polite, the most learned, and the most wealthy of the Christian name.” Their connection with Christianity was partial only; what it was that attracted them towards it, will appear below.

Now Gnosticism is a complex phenomenon, as every man has to learn who undertakes the study of it. It was divided and subdivided into *sects* or schools. These schools differed in some instances very extensively from each other, yet underneath all their diversities lay a certain principle of unity and agreement. The principles of Gnosticism therefore are those which we find in all the forms of its development. If we ascertain these we

shall have some tolerably clear notion of what Gnosticism really was.

Tertullian says, in his *Prescriptions* :—" Ipsæ denique hæreses a philosophia subornantur. Inde Aeones et formæ nescio quæ, et trinitas hominis apud Valentinum; Platonius fuerat. Inde Marcionis deus melior de tranquillitate; a stoicis venerat. Et uti anima interire dicatur, ab Epicureis observatur; et ut carnis restitutio negetur, de una omnium philosophorum schola sumitur; et ubi materia cum deo æquatur, Zenonis disciplina est; et ubi aliquid de igneo deo allegatur, Heraclitus intervenit. Eadem materiæ apud hæreticos et philosophos volutantur; iidem retractatus implicantur; unde malum et quare? et unde homo et quomodo? et quod proxime Valentinus proposuit; unde deus? scilicet de enthymesi et ectromate. (*De præscrip. Hæret.*, p. 5.) It is well understood that these and kindred other questionings which aimed at the construction of the system of the Universe, were the themes upon which Gnosticism in a special way, employed itself. This fact, however, is in itself no explanation of Gnosticism. To question is not heresy; to attempt a system of the world in the way of thought, to endeavor to set forth the relation of God to the world, is not heretical, nor anti-Catholic, for the Church boasts of and glories in her Athanasiuses and Augustines. But it is one thing to ask questions and another thing to answer them. The philosophers of antiquity, the Heresiarchs, and the Catholic Doctors alike might and did ask, whence is the world? Whence is evil? Yet, how unlike the answers which each returned. The differences among them are to be found in these rather than in the questions. There are many questions which belong alike to the sphere of philosophy and of Christian theology, but they are discussed and solved from different standpoints and in different relations. The peculiarity of Gnosticism therefore lay, not in the questions it started, but in the point of view it occupied, and in the answers it returned to them. The Church, as Neander remarks, proposed a practical solution of the questions which had agitated the mind of the world—but this, Gnosticism rejected, and claimed to know the mystery of the Universe. While faith therefore was the Christian standpoint, knowledge was that of Gnosticism. It aspired to a system of truth, each particular link of which from first to last, was within the province and reach of the human faculties. From the standpoint of knowledge it surveyed the world and God, time and eternity. Hence its name *Gnosis*—a high pitch and form of knowledge to which alone the Pneumatic men, i. e., the men of the Spirit, were admitted. Yet this throws no light upon Gnosticism itself. What Gnosticism is we learn by gathering

together the factors and ingredients which are to be found in all the Gnostic systems. We must state these first, and then the spirit or temper—the formal principle which led to the varieties of its development and manifestation. Now in all the Gnostic sects we find a recognition, (1) of a Supreme, absolute God; (2) of the Eternity of Matter; (3) of a Demiurgus; (4) of Christ. These factors appear amid all diversities, and notwithstanding profound contrarieties. Still this brings us but to the Portals of the movement. It is the spirit which sought from the factors just named to construct the system of the world, to explain and set forth the universe in the law and life of its action from the highest God to the lowest creature which challenges our interest. It aimed to express the relations of things in their organic connections. This imparts to it a philosophic character which in the estimation of Baur brings it into affinity and presents decided analogies with modern German philosophy! Gnosticism would indeed be a barren phenomenon were our knowledge of it limited simply to the material factors of which it consisted. The spirit of it, however, shaped and breathed into it its breath of life,—colored it with brilliant drapery,—and made it memorable for ages, securing for it even at this late day patient study. The factors are simple enough—God, Matter, Demiurgus, Christ,—not one of them, it will be noticed, peculiar to itself,—but these coming into minds which already bore the impress both of Greece and of the Orient, were wrought out by them into strange, cunning systems, presenting all sorts of combinations, promising men brilliant rewards, and yet proving but wind. Gnosticism indeed wove its own web: in its dusky lines are read the convolutions of an extraordinary phase of humanity—an activity which lacked solid strength, speculation which spent itself upon a dream.

Now the spirit which shaped Gnosticism was Oriental Dualism: a dualism grounded in the idea of the irreconcilable hostility between spirit and matter; the former being identical with goodness, and the latter with evil. And this Dualism found its power in the profound consciousness, in the keen pressure of evil in the world and in man. The consciousness of sin had always been feeble in the Greek mind, but it had been proportionately strong in Asia. In Greece the doctrine of the Eternity of Matter was discussed as a problem for philosophical schools: in Asia it was incorporated with the religious ideas and worship of the people. Hence when the question came, Whence is evil?—they who felt its force inclined by a sort of instinctive proclivity to Eastern solutions. For the theosophy of the East was dualistic upon this very account. It

could explain the origin and existence of evil only by believing it as self-existent. But the doctrine of the self-existence of Evil is symbolized in the war of Ormuzd and Ahriman; it had entered thoroughly and deeply into the heart of Syria and Asia Minor, though not of course in its original form. Yet this idea did present itself to the mind of the age we are now considering as a solution of the problem of Evil; and this is now and here the particular for us to comprehend. We may find fault with it as a solution, nevertheless it satisfied the men who accepted it eighteen hundred as well as three thousand years ago. Now let this be clearly understood, and we shall see how the Gnostic movement sprung up and developed itself. We plant ourselves here because we believe this to be the key to the whole thing: that it imparted to it all its peculiarities, in a word, that it made Gnosticism. Not only is it the key to the whole movement, it likewise explains the differences and contrarieties among the various Gnostic sects. For by the *character* of the Dualistic principle alone, can we understand the differing relations in which the Demiurgus stood to the Supreme God and to Christ. Hence it will be necessary to show here, how the Dualistic principle wrought in Gnosticism, especially how it can serve to unfold the varieties of the general movement itself.

As we have already noticed, Dualism in general means *that evil is self-existent*, that the supreme God is not responsible for it in any way, but that it originated without His agency and in a sphere really beyond His control. Now the notion entertained of evil itself, must affect the estimate of the strictness and of the extent of the principle of Dualism. Suppose, for example, that evil be regarded only as the absence of goodness, as the antithesis of life and light, it is very obvious that this conception will modify and soften the principle in question; while, on the other hand, if it be thought of as endued with positive life of its own, capable in its own might of waging war upon and interfering with the kingdom of life and goodness, this will have a corresponding effect in giving strength and distinctness to the Dualistic principle. And if this principle appear in all Gnosticism, if the measure and extent of it affect its various systems, it is obvious still farther that the *view entertained of the character of evil* must modify and form the whole. Herein lies the root of the differences among the Gnostics. For us, then, this is the principle of classification. We believe truly that this fact has been, we will not say overlooked, but under-estimated by the scholars who have handled this subject. With Baur, Gnosticism is a

phase of Religion-Philosophy, with Neander of Oriental Theosophy, with Möhler it is an ethical movement chiefly; and while these distinguished men, together with Gieseler and Hase have labored at the classification of Gnostic systems, they have missed, we submit with respect, the fact which explains the whole. It was found, for instance, that certain distinctions could be drawn between the Alexandrian and the Syrian Gnosis, and this served as one mode of classification; again Hase speaks of Gnosticism as Hellenic, and Oriental, and Jewish, and Christian; Neander and Baur (with some differences) classify the sects according to their relation to existing religions,—and this is very satisfactory, so far as their material principle and contents are concerned, but highly unsatisfactory when we ask, What made the relation to the existing religions? No choice, therefore, is left us but the ground just taken, that the idea which affects all, is the idea of the character and properties of evil. This explains the difference between the Alexandrian and Syrian Gnosis—the Alexandrian being more ideal, more Grecian, because the idea of evil is more negative, while the Syrian partakes more of the Persian dualism, is drawn in stronger lines, because the idea of evil assumes with it a more positive character. The differences between the two therefore are grounded in an idea and are not matters of climate or country merely. Whether now our principle of classification will hold, we shall leave the reader to determine; it will be seen, however, we think, the further we push our inquiries into the matter.

Notwithstanding the Greek culture manifest in the greater Gnostic systems, Gnosticism as such bears upon its face marks of its Oriental origin. Now, Baur has skillfully noticed the difference between the Greek and the Oriental mind in one particular which is essential to our entire subject. “God and the World,” he remarks, (*Christliche Gnosis*, p. 29,) “are considered as brought into contact through the movements of a process, which bears more or less the character of a nature-process conditioned through physical laws. The chief difference between them consists in this,—that the process in question moves either from above below, or from below upwards; either from the perfect to the less perfect, or from the imperfect to the perfect. The one tendency may be named in general, Emanation, the other Evolution. The latter presupposes as first and original, Imperfection, which still however contains within itself all the elements of a higher development, but is only the undermost foundation for the higher spiritual life, which can be developed through a series of formations in which the material principle

is engaged in continuous conflict with the spiritual. This is the standpoint of Greek Religion. . . . The view proceeding from the conception of Emanation is peculiar to the Oriental systems of Religion, which assert as their first principle the pure self-existent spirit, and which account for the material world in this way,—by the action of the spirit through a series of Potences (Potenzen) and Beings which proceed from Him as rays of Light, &c., until they come into contact with Matter.” Now Gnosticism proceeds just in this way, from the Absolute, the Uncreated God, through successive gradations down to things tangible and material. The Emanation theory is an attempt to account for the creation of the world and the phenomena of History upon a given hypothesis—of the eternity of Matter. Between the dead chaotic mass of the realm of darkness and the Highest God was a great void. There could be no point of contact between them. In themselves considered and by themselves each must remain apart from the other: both must abide within their respective limits. Chaos must continue chaotic, “without form and void.” God must dwell in the silence of His own abysmal Being. Now in order that the realm of Matter might be reached, the Gnostics supposed a sort of self-limitation upon the part of God by which certain beings were generated, called by some Aeons, by others Dunameis, (powers.) These Aeons filled the intervening space between the fountain of Light and the kingdom of darkness. The process by which they were generated, the names bestowed upon them, their relation to each other varied, in the various Gnostic systems. Nevertheless, here is a class or family peculiarity somewhat which was at once characteristic of the Gnostic theosophy, and indicative of its Oriental origin. The fundamental idea was that the Absolute God, or the Fountain of Light, produced living powers who were participants of His Own Essence. The first order of generated Beings or Aeons in their turn generated others, and so we have a succession, or graduated Hierarchy of celestial Beings, all owing their existence by ultimate derivation to the Highest God. This gradation extended on and on, farther and farther from God, each rank being less resplendent, more restricted in its capacities than those above them, until finally the outermost rank within this Pleroma—this space filled by Beings reflecting the uncreated glory, came in contact with the dead mass of matter. It is not worth while to go into the details of the variations of the fancies of particular teachers; it is sufficient to refer the student more particularly to the theory of Valentinus, at once the most complete, the most poetic of all. It will be seen now,



that this is an illustration of the Emanation theory. The starting point is perfection. Each order of Aeons, while sharing in this perfection, contains a diminished measure of it, until finally seeds of the divine life, drops of the divine Essence, fall over into and upon the material chaos. These of course receive a new nature into themselves: they are affected by the qualities of Matter. Their divine life is under eclipse, or else, according to the view taken of the nature of evil, they become opposed to the Highest God and do battle with Him, by seeking conquest over His realm. From this admixture of the Divine and the Material springs the world in the ordinary acceptation of the term: but it is not left to itself, is under a ruler or Demiurgus, and the relation of this Demiurgus to the Highest depends upon the conception of the evil which inheres in matter. Strange fantasies shoot forth here. This was the arena where the Gnostic temper found its fullest exercise. Upward and downward—towards Light and towards the Dark, with its male and female Aeons, with its personified attributes of Wisdom, and love and goodness, the commingling of the Divine and material was felt.

II. But what of the Demiurgus? What was his rank? What was his relation to the Highest God? Now it is noticeable enough that the Gnostics differed very materially in their answers to these questions. But the differences, instead of being accidental and arbitrary, were grounded in the idea of evil as inherent in matter. For the Demiurgus was supposed in some way to reflect the characteristics of the realm, over which he presided; he partook in a measure of its properties and attributes. Its shadows fell upon Him. The Demiurgus consequently, though found in all the Gnostic systems, is a variable quantity. He is not the same in all, whether we consider his powers and attributes, or his relations both to the Highest God and to Christ. While in some of them he occupies a position, we had almost said, of moral indifference, being regarded as the unwitting, unreflective agent of the Highest, carrying on and conducting the world to its consummation without any apprehension of the end (τετέλεστος) of his own Agency; in others, even as the willing instrument of his divine original; in others, finally, as the Deus Sævus—the raging, fierce being who seeks to establish a kingdom for himself, is at war with God and goodness, and strives in fact to defeat the plans of God; is hateful towards Christ, and even brings about His crucifixion. These differences are noticeable enough. We maintain that they are grounded in the logical necessities of the various Gnostic theories. The Demiurgus of Basilides

corresponds with his view of the material world; the Demiurgus of Marcion with his; the Demiurgus of Saturninus with his. There is profound difference between the Archon of Cerinthus and the Jaldabaoth of the Ophites—the one reminding us of the words of the Psalmist, “he maketh his Angels Sprits;” and the other suggesting images of Satan, of Ahriman, of a mighty power defying the Most High and at war with Him. Notwithstanding the diverse conceptions of the Demiurgus, among the Gnostics, they agree that he was not only, as his name generally imports, the God of this world, but especially the God of the Jews. And hence as they regarded Him, so also they regard Judaism. This explains the reason why some of the Gnostics treated with a degree of respect the Jewish economy, viewing it as a true anticipation of the Gospel—as the sphere of the Psychical man, while others utterly repudiated and scorned it. The Alexandrian Gnosis stood much more nearly to the Jewish Alexandrian Theology than the Syrian, and Judaism in its view was well enough in its day, and better than heathenism. They, however, who hated the Demiurgus, hated it, because it was the sphere of his revelation. This latter phase of Gnosticism culminated perhaps in the Cainites, who rendered peculiar honor to the criminals and rascals of Holy Writ, because they were the enemies of the God of the Jews. Thus potent was the effect of the notion of the Demiurgus in the sphere of criticism: in the light of it they interpreted the history of the past: inclining to or rejecting all Judaistic ideas just in proportion as they considered the Demiurgus an object of indifference, on the one hand, or of hate on the other.

We find, likewise, the same principle as applied to Heathenism. Heathenism was the religion of Matter, the deification of the properties and attributes of matter. It was not, therefore, strictly the dispensation and economy of the Demiurgus. Nevertheless, it had its place in History, and the more ideal of the Gnostics would treat it, not unlike the way in which it was treated by the Alexandrian Church Fathers, while the more material, dualistic Gnostics, rejected and disowned it entirely, as being evil and hateful.

The relation, then, of Gnostics to existing religions, depended entirely upon the notion formed of the Demiurgus, and this latter notion was throughout colored and shaped according to the conception of evil, as the negative (ideal) or the positive (material dualistic) element prevailed. This alone, we repeat, throws light upon and solves the varieties and the contrarieties brought out in the view of the Demiurgus.

III. Certainly thus far, we see nothing in Gnosticism, whether in its formal or its material character, which authorizes us to regard it in any sense as a phase or expression of Christianity. No connection with it, no dependence upon it, no obligation to it in the way of thought, are discernible in its Emanation theory, in its view of matter, in the idea of a Demiurgus. In fact, it is at war with Christianity in its standpoint and in its contents. If the Phenomenon we name Gnosticism had appeared with just these characteristics and no more, it is plain enough that it would have been considered as one of the expiring struggles of the Old World, as an effort by the fusion of Greek Philosophy and Oriental Theosophy, to revive the declining faith of men in God—would have been in fact placed in the categories of Neo-Platonism. But the Gnostics were impressed with the idea of Redemption, if not in the Church's sense, nevertheless in a sense all-important to themselves. They believed that they could rise victorious over the powers of death and darkness; that they could soar beyond the realm of the Demiurgus; that they could become dwellers in the sphere of Eternal Light. Now this idea of Redemption from the thralldom of matter and sin, brought them into connection with Christ. They regarded Him as the power or instrument whereby this blessed result was to be consummated. And that men, with the peculiar taste for speculation, with such a bias for phantasies should have turned to the Christian Church so early in her career, when the profession of the Christian name, to say the least, involved reproach, that they should have looked to Christ as to a power that could place them beyond the province of the Demiurgus, is a striking proof of the enormous energy, and of the profound impression produced upon men by the preaching of the Apostles and of their immediate successors. The Gnostics in their thinking, whether we consider its form or its matter, exhibit no affinity with the Gospel, and yet they believed after their own fashion in Christ, and in so far as they were Christians we must find their Christianity in their doctrine of Christ. The Christology of Gnosticism made it at once Christian and heretical, brought it into association with the Christian Church and repelled it from her. It is curious, and not without its lesson for us, to notice how early in the life of Christianity, men took its central fact, wrenched it from its own soil, and transformed a living person, our Lord Jesus Christ, into a phantasy. As the Demiurgus under various guises is characteristic of Gnosticism as such, so Christ is found in all its systems; but not the Christ of the New Testament, not the Christ of the Church's Faith. One may say that the

only thing it has in common with the Church, is the name of Christ. At one with the Church in the confession of His Name, it is at war with her in the conception of His Person. It could not, without parting with its foundation and superstructure, alike receive Christ as God-Man. It must accept Him, if at all, under the conditions which its general standpoint and the logical necessities of its own ideas, required. It was a cardinal axiom with the Gnostics that there could be no direct contact or communication between the Highest God and matter. Hence, whatsoever they might think of Christ, howsoever varied might be their conception of Him, they could not regard Him as God-Incarnate. How, then, may the Gnostic idea of Christ be stated? Yet here we find a most conspicuous exhibition of the radical and fatal defects of Gnosticism as such. For not acknowledging any real union of the human and the divine in the Person of our Lord, the Gnostic Leaders had recourse to their own fancies and fashioned Him in accordance with their prevailing intellectual habit. They distinguished between the man Jesus—"the Psychical Messiah" and the Redeemer or Saviour. They held, in fact, to two Christs, Jesus and the Aeon, or higher power expressed by various names, whom they supposed to have descended upon the earthly Jesus at His Baptism. This was not incompatible at all with the recognition of the reality of our Lord's human nature. His body and being according to this view might have been as real as that of any man. The redeeming Aeon spoke through Him, used Him as his organ or vehicle of communication, but left Him before the hour of His Death. There were others, however, who denied the reality of our Lord's Body and manhood at all, considering Him as an apparition only, as an unreal phantom, employed by the redeeming Spirit to publish the Gospel of Redemption. While, then, some recognized the humanity of Christ, others rejected it—all in the meanwhile repudiating the Church's doctrine, and none submitting to the real teaching of the Gospel respecting Christ—Whence the difference? Obviously the answer is the same by which we have explained the differences among them in other particulars. We find that they who were more influenced by Greek Philosophy, by the idea of the negative characteristics of evil, favored one mode of representation, and they who were under the dominion of a harder, more material view of the power of evil, the other mode. The Idealizing Gnostics recognized the Earthly life of Christ; they who hated all contact with matter, denied that Earthly Life and Being. The Lord Jesus occupied the place then, in the

Gnostic Systems, which their prevailing antecedent bias required. They made up for their denials of History by expending the utmost powers of their fancy, in their statement of His position and work. In particular, we call the attention of the student to the Christology of Valentinus, as being the most perfect exhibition of the Gnostic genius and Spirit.

We have abstained from any statement of the details of these systems; these can be found in all the Church Histories. It has been our object to set forth the formal principle, and the material contents of Gnosticism, in the hope that they who are interested in such matters may be assisted in their studies of this enigmatic movement, and that instead of being bewildered by uncouth names, they will trace ideas at work in it, which were widely spread throughout the civilized world at the beginning of the Christian Era. We hope to conclude our notice of the subject by showing its ethical principle and its real relation to the Christian Church.

## ART. VII.—THE EARLY HISTORY OF RELIGION.

1. *Progress of Religious Ideas through Successive Ages.* By L. MARIA CHILD. New York: C. S. FRANCIS & Co. 1856. 3 vols. 12mo.
2. *The Heathen Religion in its Popular and Symbolical Development.* By Rev. JOSEPH B. GROSS. Boston. 1856. 12mo.
3. *The Religions of the World, in their Relation to Christianity.* By F. D. MAURICE. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1854. 16mo.
4. *Christ and other Masters: an Historical Inquiry into some of the Chief Parallelisms and Contrasts between Christianity and the Religious Systems of the Ancient World, with Special Reference to Prevailing Difficulties and Objections.* By CHARLES HARDWICK, M. A., Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge. Part II: *Religions of India.* Cambridge: Macmillan. 1857. 8vo. pp. 219.
5. *Hulsean Lectures for 1846.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, M. A. Philadelphia: H. Hooker. 1850.

Few writers of the present day have done more for the elucidation of Christian truth, than the author of the Hulsean Lectures. His Notes on the Parables, and on the Miracles, are a noble gift to the Church, and entitle him to the gratitude of every student of God's Word. The Hulsean Lectures, too, for 1845, are full of deep searchings into the meaning of Holy Scripture, and of beautiful illustrations of some of the rich treasures there contained. The Lectures for 1846, although not equal, as we think, to the former series, are yet a valuable addition to Christian literature, and abound with fine conceptions and pleasing imagery. The very title of these Lectures—"Christ the Desire of all nations, or The Unconscious Prophecies of Heathendom," is itself beautifully suggestive, and is of more value than some whole volumes which we have seen. Mr. Trench has been very successful in turning their own weapons upon one class of the ancient and the modern assailants of Christianity by the development of this idea, and to the elucidation of this argument our present discussion is mainly directed.

The old form of the Anti-Christian argument which Mr.



Trench encounters was this. There have been a great many religions, analogous in some of their leading features to Christianity, which have been as firmly believed as Christianity ever was, but which are now acknowledged to be false—therefore Christianity is as false as they, and will share the fate of every preceding delusion.

A sufficient answer to this most shallow sophism, is found in the simple fact, that there is and can be no such thing as a falsehood, except as the denial, departure from, or corruption of some Truth. The acceptance and prevalence of false religions therefore proves, not that all religions are false, *but that there must be a true religion*. The existence and circulation of numerous counterfeit bank-notes may render it difficult to ascertain which is genuine; but they all prove and presuppose the existence of one which is genuine, and from its acknowledged existence they derive their fictitious value. This argument is well drawn out by Mr. Trench, in presenting the various striking features of the religions of heathendom.

But Mr. Trench, by following the common opinion as to the origin of the heathen religions, has departed from the facts, and has thereby weakened the conclusive force of his argument, and given countenance to the latest form of infidel assault upon Christianity. The admission is made throughout the work, and in this he has followed Milman, that all the great features of the heathen religion were "the world's divination at the least;" were the result of the needs and aspirations of humanity; the attempted realization of the unassisted longings and deep yearnings of the soul.

On this popular view of the origin of heathen religion, the modern Pantheistic representation of Christianity is founded. That representation does not by any means deny the truth of the Christian religion. On the contrary, it affirms that this religion is essential to humanity, as its elevator and purifier. But it declares that its truths are only the development of human want and urgency—the spontaneous product of the soul's desires, affections, and intellectual throes and efforts. And in support of this hypothesis, it adduces the striking analogies to the Christian religion which all other religions present; their sacrifices of deprecation and atonement, their hero-worship, their hopes and anticipations of a Deliverer, and of a better condition of the world. It offers these, as the germinant state of the Divine idea which was struggling to the birth—the early efforts of the immature intellect to realize its conceptions, and to give body and form to the needs and aspirations of the soul. It sets forth Christ as the highest realiza-

tion of this glorious ideal of humanity, the most perfect embodiment of the struggling thoughts and desires of men that the world has yet seen. To reach up to the ideal excellency portrayed in this representation of humanity, is salvation. Until human progress shall attain to a loftier symbol of perfection, to a Diviner Christ; the present Christ must be confessed and aspired to as a model of a true man to which all other men should be conformed. This latest refinement of philosophic infidelity acknowledges a God—a present Deity. But this God is not a personal Deity. He, or rather it, is the mere *abstract idea* of truth, love, goodness, &c., developed and personated in the glorious aspects of nature; and chiefly in man, the head and summit of nature. Christ, therefore, is most truly God; because man is God, and Christ is the perfect ideal of humanity.

Now the known historic origin of Christianity is the sufficient answer to all this speculation, refinement, and nonsense. But the assumption on which it is founded, and which has been too readily admitted by Christian writers generally, as well as by our author, is disproved by two very different modes of argument. In the first place, it is altogether gratuitous, and unwarranted by any *a priori* reason, to suppose that any religion, true or false, would ever have originated from human nature. It is most true that there is in the soul of man, an adaptation to religious truth; and this fact proves that religion is a truth, a reality, a production of the same Almighty power and goodness which formed the soul. It is the same kind of proof which the eye affords of the correlative existence of light; or the ear, of the corresponding existence of an arrangement for the production of sound. For they are necessary to each other; and either independent of the other would be worthless and without a purpose. In the same way, the adaptation of man's nature to religion, proves that religion is a truth, just as certainly as we can know that man himself is a true and real being. But, all this is very different from the proposition that man has ever originated religious truth for himself, out of the depths of his own nature, or by the unassisted operations of his own powers. Such a conclusion is as remote from the premises, as that the eye produces light, because it is capable of perceiving the light when externally presented.

We do not deny the abstract possibility that the mind of man might discover a truth of religion; but we deny the fact that any such discovery ever has been made, and we question the *a priori* probability that it ever would be made. It is a

very pretty sentiment, indeed, to talk about the deep thoughts, and the intense yearnings of the innermost soul of a savage. But yet we know that his thoughts and his yearnings are in fact prompted by his appetites and his passions. And the reasonable conclusion is, that religious truth, in order to be perceived and recognized by the soul of man, must first be embodied into some external and sensible form, either of language or symbol. That is to say—the Creator, when He gave to man the capacity to apprehend and employ religious truth, must have provided that capacity with some external expression and embodiment of the truth, so to be recognized and employed; else that portion of man's nature would have remained a mere waste, without exercise and without a purpose.

This supposition corresponds precisely with the facts of the case. All the known facts lead irresistibly to the same result. The Pantheistic theory, taking as its postulate the gratuitous admission of Christian writers, assumes that the various religions of the world have originated from the affections and the intellectual capacities of men—that the earlier efforts of the race in this department were rudimental and imperfect, in accordance with the character and attainments of barbarous men in the lowest stages of social existence—but that these, by the advancing mind of the race, have been gradually improved into Christianity; and which, so far from being complete, will be developed hereafter into something else. Hence the contortions without the inspiration of our modern Sibyls. The facts of the case are, that the purest religion, the best theology—these very persons being judges—is found in the earliest age of human existence, in the very infancy of society. The well authenticated records of an inconsiderable people, inhabiting a small territory on the Western border of Asia, present us five hundred years before the commencement of the historic period in Europe, with a purer religion, with a nobler theology, than the world has ever yet seen, except that which it promised and prefigured, and of which it was the announced preparation. *The farther we depart from this central point of light and knowledge, the more degraded and trifling and corrupt does the religion of men become.* The true and legitimate deduction from the facts is, that the only operation of unassisted man upon or with religion, has been to vitiate and corrupt it. Instead of originating a religion of any sort, true or false, men, left to themselves, have invariably failed to retain the religious knowledge which they once possessed, and have as invariably proceeded to change that truth of God into a lie, into some fantastic form of falsehood and delusion. This is

certainly St. Paul's account of the way in which the heathen religions began and were developed.

We are presented in the Old Testament with the purest Theism, the most elevating religion, originating in the very infancy of the human race, and representing itself to be but an anticipation and a promise of a yet higher and nobler belief. In the New Testament, we have the fulfillment of this promise by the development of Judaism into the full and glorious proportions of Christianity, consummated and perfected in a single age. This religion professes to be, in its origin and in every step of its progress, a Revelation, and not the product of human feelings and faculties. And furthermore, all the religious knowledge now existing among enlightened nations, all the grand conceptions and beautiful thoughts of the very deniers of revelation, come from this professed revelation. Wherever the light of this revelation shines not, there is darkness and ignorance; there grand conceptions and beautiful thoughts about man and religion are utterly unknown. Such are the facts upon one side.

Not a single instance can be named in which a religion, of human or Divine origin, has been developed by the progressive energies of the human mind to a higher and better state. No such instance has ever been alleged. The religion of the Bible is the only one that has ever made a single step in advance. The history of every other, is a history of deterioration and corruption. The earlier faith of every nation is better than that which succeeded it, unless the change or reformation has been in some way the product of that one religion which originated in Palestine. The hypothesis of Pantheism, then, is based upon palpable and notorious falsehood. The facts not only fail to give any support to the theory, but they are strong enough to prove a negative. This theory, and all the infidel schemes which have preceded it, are a continuation of the same perverse effort of the human mind to deal dishonestly with the truth which God has graciously revealed for the salvation of men.

We propose to give a rapid sketch of the facts in the history of Revealed Religion, showing that the Providence of God has always taken care that the Truth should be externally witnessed to men, and that from this testimony, all the truth in the religious systems of heathendom is derived. The whole religious history of man will be found to be both a proof and a continuous illustration of this fact, viz, that there are two sets of antagonistic forces continually operating upon human nature. The one is extrinsic, being religious truth, revealed by the

Almighty, to elevate, purify, perfect and carry out, the original design and purpose of human nature. The other is the innate corruption of the human heart, assisted by external forces, seeking to carry on the process of corruption, to despoil yet more entirely the work of God, to deface yet more utterly the image of Himself which He planted in human nature, and thus weakening by every possible expedient, the remedial and purifying force and power of that religion which God gave to be the restorer and the perfecter of humanity. The religious history of man is, therefore, the history of this one true Religion which came from God, and of a vast multitude of corruptions of that truth which have been substituted for it by the subtle devices of the human heart.

Revealed religion, from the first, consisted of a few simple Articles of Faith and Institutions of Worship. These two were inseparably bound together,—the latter containing and setting forth the former. Together, they consisted of: 1st, The knowledge of One Only God; 2nd, The confession of man's guilt and helplessness, his consequent desert of punishment, and dependence upon Divine grace for the ability to do good; 3rd, The belief that God had provided an atonement or satisfaction for sin, by virtue of which He was enabled to be merciful to our unrighteousness; 4th, The expression of this Faith in varied rites of sacrifice.

The Faith and the Institutions of the true religion have always been inseparably united. For if the truth of our relations to God had merely been revealed in words, as an abstract conception of the mind, there is no reason to believe that the knowledge thus conveyed would have outlasted a single generation. All the natural tendencies and the actual working of the human mind, are to a fatal obliviousness or perversion of pure religious truth. That truth is only maintained in its purity and power by the constant operation of an external system, embodying and holding forth the truth, for the governance and guidance of human life and action. And therefore, the Church, an organized, visible and perpetual society, to which is committed the care and direction of the institutions which contain, preserve, and set forth this revealed truth, is just as essential to the right working of human nature, considered in its relations to God, as the Family and the State are to the right working of the same nature, considered in its social relations to this world. The Church in its first dispensation included the whole of mankind, the Priesthood being especially committed to the first born of each family.

By this Divine combination of spiritual truth with sensible

institutions, religion was so incorporated into the very being and life of men that it could by no possibility be utterly lost, or altogether forgotten. The only way in which it could be successfully assailed, was by the insidious process of gradual corruption. And there were materials enough in human nature to render such a process eminently successful. Religion, pure and holy, appealed, indeed, with power and effect to all that was noble and generous in our fallen nature ; but the same religion was, of necessity, most offensive to the corruptions which it sought to extirpate from that nature. How natural and easy was it then for a deceived heart to yield to the seductions of an ingenious sophistry which undertook to reconcile the hopes and the sanctities of religion with those very corruptions which were now a part of the cherished nature of every man ! So natural and easy was this mode of dealing with religion, that it began in the beginning. In the bosom of the infant Church arose that first corruption, the suggestion of a proud and infidel spirit, which has been the type of one of the forms of error in every succeeding age.

The shedding of blood in sacrifice was an institution purely arbitrary, and was the most humiliating confession of human guilt, and a most emphatic declaration of the reliance of the offerer upon the atonement for sin which God would provide. The proud heart of Cain revolted from this feature of the religion that God had revealed. Any other sacrifice than this—the thank offering of the fruits of the earth in testimony of his gratitude to God—accorded very well with his notions of fitness and propriety. This Eucharistic sacrifice he was willing enough to make. But his refusal to offer the bloody sacrifices of atonement which had been commanded, was either an insolent assumption of a perfect righteousness which needed no expiation, or an impeachment of the Divine character as utterly deficient in the essential attribute of justice—supposing that He could look upon sin with favor or allowance. Either of these suppositions was a fatal and destructive error, and the worship founded upon them would be an offense to the Divine Majesty. Only in our true character as sinners can we come before God ; and we can come in that character only through that way of access which He has appointed, and in which He has promised to pardon and to take away our sin. The offering of the proud rationalist, Cain, was therefore indignantly rejected by the Holy Being whom he had insulted by such an oblation ; while the faith of Abel, in humbly bringing the instituted token at once of his sin, of the desert of that sin, and



of the provision for its pardon, was graciously accepted and blessed.

From the fact that no reference is made in the history of the Antediluvian Church to the prevalence of superstition or idolatry, it is probable that the descendants of Cain followed that corruption of religion which their father had originated. The rapidity with which impiety and wickedness rose to such a height as to require the destruction of the whole race, is another reason for coming to the same conclusion. For, fatal as are the errors of superstition and idolatry, they do not run their course so rapidly, and terminate so soon in atheism and irreligion, as the opposite error of self-righteous infidelity.

The descendants of Seth were distinguished for a time by their faith and piety from these wicked followers of the first murderer. But when these two families began to contract marriages with each other, the contagion of wickedness was found to be much more powerful than the allurements of virtue, and the whole race became alike degenerate and unworthy. For the period of 120 years, Noah and his family, with a few of the older Patriarchs who survived during a part of this time, were the only faithful professors of the true religion in the midst of a world given up to impiety and wickedness. At last that wonderful vindication of the moral government of God, the Deluge, came, and once more the earth was to be peopled by that remnant of the race of man which was miraculously preserved in the Ark. To call into question either of these miracles, the Deluge, or the preservation in the Ark, upon the ground of difficulties growing out of the ordinary laws of nature, is very absurd. *Both were miracles*—that is, exertions of Divine power above and beyond those ordinary operations of the same power which belong to the usual condition of the world—or, the phenomena did not occur. Admit a God, who is also a moral Ruler of men, and these miracles with all their circumstances become just as probable exercises of Almighty power as any of the common phenomena of nature.

The traditional records of every people upon the earth, go back to this event in some form of myth or fable, as the origin of their state—thus presenting an unanswerable argument to the truth of the narrative contained in the book of Genesis. This testimony is independent of the Divine attestation to the facts given in that book. The authentic history of all nations, and the known gradual progress of emigration from the valley of the Euphrates to the confines of the earth in every direction, prove, beyond contradiction, that the beginning of the present

race of mankind cannot be traced to an earlier period than the division of the earth among the sons of Noah. Every nation, but the Hebrew, in seeking for its origin, loses itself in some faint traces of the preservation of its progenitor from this terrible catastrophe. In the Bible alone, have we a distinct and plain narrative, which accounts for, while it reconciles the traditions of other people. Those famous astronomical tables of Chaldea, upon which the enemies of religion counted so largely a hundred years ago, have long since turned out to have been mere calculations backwards from a comparatively recent period.

For a long time after this signal manifestation of God's anger against impiety, there seems to have been no tendency upon the part of men to naked irreligion, or to that infidel form of error which had characterized the Cainites of the Antediluvian period. The opposite corruptions, superstition and idolatry, now began to prevail. The departures from the truth were gradual. At first, the glorious luminaries of day and night were adored as the *Shekinahs*—the visible manifestations of the Divine Presence—the beneficent protectors and guardians of the world. It was easier for the fancy to endow these beauteous objects with personality and intelligence, and for men to put their trust in them, than to ascend above all created things and recognize the superintending providence of the One, Unseen and Infinite Being, of whose goodness these glorious creations are but the insensible instruments.

In the age of these first beginnings of idolatrous departure from the truth, lived the holy Patriarch, Job. For we find him referring to Sabianism, or the worship of the heavenly bodies, as a crime which deserved to be punished; and this is the only kind of idolatry alluded to in that most ancient book. Endeavoring to avert the reproach of his friends, he says:

"If I beheld the sun when it shined,  
Or the moon walking in brightness;  
And my heart hath been secretly enticed,  
Or my mouth hath kissed my hand;  
This also were an iniquity to be punished by the Judge;  
For I should have denied the God that is above."

This remarkable book presents a beautiful picture of Patriarchism, or the religion of the first dispensation in its purity and simplicity. Job was a Prince, "the greatest of all the men of the East." He was likewise, according to the Patriarchal rule, the Priest of his family. And when his sons and daughters were engaged in the festivities appropriate to their age and station, he, with paternal solicitude and with pious

care, "rose up early in the morning and offered burnt offerings, according to the number of them all, for Job said, 'it may be that my sons have sinned and cursed God in their hearts.' Thus did Job continually." As God has never left Himself without a faithful witness upon earth, it is reasonable to conclude that this Patriarch was the illustrious preacher of righteousness and witness to the truth in the age immediately preceding the general prevalence of idolatry, and the consequent call of Abraham.

Men did not long rest in Sabianism, the most natural form of idolatry. The beginnings of error once allowed, the descent is rapidly accomplished. Humanity sinks by the downward tendency of its own corruptions. And as all error is a corruption of, and presupposes some truth, so the next form of idolatry which presents itself, is a travesty of that profound mystery of Godliness which had been obscurely revealed, the Incarnation of Deity. The idea thus presented of God appearing in human form, as the Saviour of men, was soon perverted by the plastic power of a corrupt imagination into the Deification of those illustrious progenitors of the race who had been most revered, or loved, or feared. And this remarkable fact attests, at once, the common origin of all nations, and the truth of this account of one of the forms of pagan idolatry. As every nation traced its own beginning to a general deluge, so it is obvious, that when the Deification of men began, none would be so likely to be placed first in the rank of the Gods as this mysterious progenitor and his immediate descendants—the second planters and renewers of the race of man. Accordingly, the mythological fables of every nation go up to the Patriarch Noah, and to his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japhet, whom, under various titles, they represent as the Fathers of Gods and men. In the Greek mythology, Noah was represented by Saturn, and his three sons by Pluto, Jupiter, and Neptune. The earliest fables concerning them among every people, are legendary perversions of the true history of the Deluge, of their miraculous escape, and of the new peopling of the earth. Each nation, indeed, claimed these mystic personages as its own immediate founders, and laid the scene of their adventures in its own country. But this was a plain consequence of the same combination of ignorance and pride which induced all people to claim to be the aborigines of their respective countries. Such a mistake cannot affect the conclusion, that this universal, although variously modified tradition, must have been the product of a common truth.

The period at which we have now arrived, presents another

remarkable event which has exercised the most important influence upon the destiny of men. That cherished dream of unchastened ambition, the establishment of a universal empire, was first sought to be realized in the plain of Shinar, and was there signally rebuked, and rendered forever impracticable by the confusion of tongues which occurred at the building of the tower of Babel. It is impossible to enter upon the question of the origin and distinction of language. We must be content with the statement of a single, but pregnant fact. The languages of all the principal nations of the earth, have been clearly traced, by the investigations and labors of successive philologists, to three distinct and independent fountains or roots. These three underived and unconnected languages, are the Sanscrit, the Arabic, and the Slavonic. These languages are not separated from each other by large geographical spaces, but they are all found together in the neighborhood of that region where all history places the beginning of empire, and the earliest center of population. And from this center, the various dialects proceeding from each of these languages, have spread themselves in different directions over the earth. Thus have the results of modern research, upon a new and untrodden path of enquiry, added an unexpected confirmation to the simple statement of the inspired historian, by tracing all the principal dialects of the earth to three primitive languages, which are found together in the very region where the distinction of language was first effected by a Divine interposition.

After the confusion of language, and the dispersion of the nations, the progress of corruption seems to have been fearfully rapid. The worship of good and great men as the incarnations of Deity, was soon succeeded by the worship of Evil Spirits—Demonolatry. The principle which produced the second class of Divinities, gave birth to a third and a fourth class. For each one of these Superior Deities, as they now began to be regarded, must have likewise a symbol, or earthly representative. Some animate or inanimate thing, a fountain, a river, a bird, or beast, or image, was esteemed sacred to some particular Deity—the earthly emblem and representative of the God. To this symbol of a symbol, a *relative* worship might lawfully be paid, says the Catechism of the Council of Trent in defense of a later idolatry, the adoration offered to the type being referred to the prototype! It was convenient thus to present to the ever present symbol, the worship that was required by the absent God; just, it is said again, *as in his Ministers we honor the King*. Alas! these early corruptors of the true religion

had forgotten, in their blindness, that the only Being to whom man should offer religious worship, is never absent. And thus, by a wretched sophistry, the suggestion of the malignant fiend who wages an interminable war against the holiness and happiness of man, the whole race was brought to bow down in abject and stupid adoration of stocks and stones, of lizards and oxen! By such degeneration, religion, instead of being the savor and purifier of humanity, was wrested into an instrument of its deeper degradation. For, in process of time, the moral and religious feelings of man were so perverted, that even his vices and impurities were consecrated by the holy name of religion, and by obscene and horrid rites.

It is not probable that the lowest point of this descent had been reached at the time of the call of Abraham. Such a supposition is inconsistent with the general course of Divine Providence, and is contradicted by the express notices which we have of a purer theology down to the time of the Exodus from Egypt. Only in some particular regions, where wealth and luxury aided the work of ruin, was the lowest depth of moral debasement reached in an early day. Sodom and Gomorrah soon filled up the measure of their iniquities; the kingdoms of Canaan had done so before the invasion of that country by the Israelites under Joshua. But in most countries the restraining influence of God's Spirit, with God's appointed witnesses, retarded in some degree the progress of error, maintained among the nations some sense of the primitive meaning of their religious rites, and preserved humanity from utter and irretrievable corruption, until the age appointed for the coming of Messiah.

Among the earliest of these divine testimonies, was the institution of Sacrifice. This Sacrifice was a material offering made to God, expressive of the worshiper's faith and feelings. It is of two sorts—propitiatory and eucharistic; or, sacrifices of deprecation and of thanksgiving. Sacrifice, by the immolation of living victims, was that Divinely instituted sacrament which set forth the cardinal truths of religion,—that man is a sinner—that he is therefore subject to the curse of the violated law—and that God has provided a ransom, an all-sufficient satisfaction for his sin. In this instituted rite, these revealed truths were fully, though mystically contained; and by it the whole race of mankind were continually engaged in the expression of this primitive faith. Thereby was prefigured and shadowed forth the Lord's death until He came. Thereby the purity, holiness, and justice of God were vindicated in connection with the manifestation of love and mercy. But it

was only as a Sacrament—the instituted symbol of the truth of God and of the faith of men—that this Divine right was thus holy and significant. Thus alone was it the token and the seal of the covenant between God and men, where the two met together. On the part of Almighty God requiring and accepting this sacrifice, it was the token and pledge of His merciful purpose to provide a sufficient satisfaction for sin; and, on account of that intended satisfaction, to receive His repentant creatures into favor. On the part of man it was the token and pledge of his faith in the promised atonement, and of his engagement obediently to follow the commands of God. To change this rite from a Sacrament, thus high and holy in its design and uses, into an offering, meritorious and satisfactory in itself, was to degrade it into an impertinence and an absurdity. But such a degradation of this institution naturally followed the corresponding degradation of the objects of human worship. Such gods as men now worshiped, might well be appeased by such offerings as they made; the sacrifices being considered as complete in themselves, and satisfactory by their own intrinsic value. It was a natural consequence, therefore, that when the Gods seemed to be unusually vengeful, their deluded votaries should increase the value of their offerings, until they gave the fairest and most beautiful of their offspring. Thus were *human* sacrifices established among every people.

But yet God never left Himself without witness among men to the whole truth which He revealed. In the early periods of this apostasy, therefore, and before it was universal, He sent His servant Abraham to go forth and testify the truth by his life—by his words. With him God—the Angel-Jehovah—talked familiarly. With him the ancient covenant of life was renewed, and its terms made more specific; and to him were the mysteries of redemption more fully revealed. The various journeyings of this illustrious father of the faithful, from Assyria to Egypt, back and forth, in fulfillment of his Divine mission, brought him into personal intercourse with the principal nations of the earth. Doubtless the example and the admonitions of this great man gave a powerful impulse to the declining spirit of Patriarchism, revived the knowledge and profession of the truth, and restrained the growing tendency to superstition and idolatry. This testimony was continued by his sons Isaac and Jacob, and these three Patriarchs have left an impress upon the people of those countries which even yet is not effaced.

The Patriarch Joseph was, however, a still more emphatic witness to the truth. It is evident from various sources of information, that the arts and sciences attained to a degree of



perfection in Egypt hitherto unparalleled. The peculiar position and the wonderful fertility of that country, tended to foster intellectual culture. Egypt became the school whence all the nations of the West derived the rudiments of learning and knowledge. And into that country, the very center of the world's civilization, God conducted the chosen depositories of His truth. There they remained for four hundred years, the living, and, for a time, the persecuted witnesses to the truth, and the only protestants of that age against the absurd and infamous mummeries which were gradually usurping the place of true religion. And their emphatic testimony to the supremacy and the holiness of the One only and True God, the wonderful history of their Exodus, their sojourn in the wilderness, and their conquest of Canaan, must have attracted the attention of all the inhabited portions of the three continents, and have caused the name and the power of the God of Israel to be known and understood in all the world.

Just about the time of these remarkable transactions, viz, between fifteen hundred and fourteen hundred years before Christ, Cecrops and Danaus from Egypt, and Cadmus from Phenicia, successively conducted colonies into Greece; and introduced the first elements of civilization into a country which, until then, had only been inhabited by a few wandering savages subsisting upon the spontaneous fruits of the earth. The close connection in time and place of these early colonists of Europe, with the chosen depositories of the true religion, cannot fail to be observed.

We reach now a remarkable epoch in the history of the true religion. Down to the legation of Moses, no change had been made, by Divine authority, in the original Patriarchal dispensation. The progress of human wickedness, however, had become fearful. The seed of Abraham, therefore, carefully preserved, and raised up to be a great nation, was now solemnly set apart and consecrated by the Almighty, to be a kingdom of Priests unto Him—the keepers of the oracles of God, and the guardians of the worship and institutions which He had ordained. From among this kingdom of Priests, again, their Divine Lawgiver selected a distinct class of men, carefully arranged in three ranks or orders, to whom were assigned, in a more special and eminent manner, the duties of the Priesthood. The scrupulous maintenance of the distribution of offices thus made was secured by sanctions, the rigor and inviolability of which were attested once for all by the summary punishment inflicted upon Nadab and Abihu, and upon Korah and his company.

The leading principle of the entire Mosaic institution seems

to have been to embody the truth into so many forms, into such a burdensome ritual, that the greater part of the time and thoughts of the people would be engrossed by the ever-recurring actions in which the truth was thus embodied; so that no nation could be retained in the obedient profession and practice of such a religion, except by a perpetual miracle—the manifest and visible care of Jehovah rewarding their scrupulous obedience with unbounded national and domestic prosperity. That is to say, they were literally constituted a nation of Priests, whose vocation and duty it was to give themselves up to the purposes of their election—to do with faithful diligence all those things appointed unto them, and in which was contained the sublime testimony which they were to bear to the whole world. The care of their temporal interests was to be intrusted wholly and entirely to the Lord Jehovah, who had taken upon Himself the maintenance and protection of His people. The preservation and prosperity of this people were thus to be an illustrious miracle, perpetually attesting the truth of the testimony which they gave. The whole subsequent history of the nation shows, that God was eminently faithful to His part of this engagement.

Another important feature was now for the first time introduced under the Mosaic dispensation. In the Patriarchal dispensation, the Truth had been authoritatively embodied only in the Sacraments, and in the living testimony of the Church. Moses, however, was commanded to put that truth in writing, and to preserve the record thereof in the ark of the testimony. Here there was a threefold and concurring testimony, each distinct and independent of the other, to the same truth of Heaven. This completed the securities for its full, intelligible, and uncorrupt transmission from generation to generation. Human ingenuity can suggest no better warrant than this threefold, concurrent testimony of independent witnesses.

The chosen people were now to be stationed as God's witnesses in the land long before promised to their Fathers. And how admirably does that land seem to have been selected! Lying just at the base of that great Sea, which laves the shores, and indents with its gulfs and bays, and estuaries, the richest and most important portions of the three ancient continents, Europe, Asia, and Africa! Immediately adjoining, on the East, is that extensive and fertile region of Asia, which all history and the acknowledged progress of emigration attest to have been the cradle of the human race—the earliest seat of the Arts and of Empire. A little to the Southwest lies the rich valley of the Nile. In the West, the peninsula of Greece, as we have stated, a regular settlement had been commenced by colonists

from Egypt and Phenicia. *The five hundred years succeeding this emigration is the fabulous period of Grecian history.* But for one thousand years after the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan, down to the time of the Persian invasion of Greece, nearly the whole burden of history is composed of the wars, revolutions, and alternate successes of the two great empires, East and South of the Holy Land—the Assyrian and the Egyptian. Each successive conqueror enlarged the bounds of empire by bringing under his dominion more distant tribes and nations, which before had been too inconsiderable to attract attention or regard. So that it was no Eastern hyperbole when Nebuchadnezzar, and Darius, and Cyrus, call upon all nations, and people, and tongues, to listen to their decrees.

The land of Canaan was placed just between these two great empires—the alternate claimants of universal dominion. No intercourse could take place between them, either friendly, or hostile, except through this territory. This was the important and interesting country selected by the Almighty for His chosen witnesses. Here and in all the neighboring countries did the Father of the faithful wander, a preacher of righteousness; and here were his descendants planted to hold up the light of truth conspicuously to mankind.

That great city Tyre, the imperial queen of the seas, which so early became the commercial emporium of the world, was the seaport of this same country Canaan. Although this city maintained its independence, yet we know that the most friendly and intimate intercourse, founded upon the mutual necessities of their situation, subsisted between its inhabitants and the people of Israel. Here, then, we see the chosen depositories of eternal truth in habits of daily and familiar association with the inhabitants of that remarkable city whose merchants, and traders, and seamen carried on the commerce of the world; and who continually dispatched colonies of her people to erect cities upon coasts hitherto unexplored. The merchant-princes of Tyre must have carried to remotest regions the fame of that one almighty Being Whom David praised, and to Whom, Solomon, assisted by Hiram, King of Tyre, erected that glorious House of Prayer, the first temple.

The punishment and subsequent dispersion of Israel for their unfaithfulness tended no less to the production of the same great results. By that dispersion, witnesses of God were sent everywhere, scattered among the principal nations of the earth. They carried their Holy Scriptures, the forms of their religious worship, and their strong testimony against idolatry and corruption, into Egypt and into all the cities

of the Babylonian, and subsequently of the larger Persian empire. From this first dispersion many of them never returned; but remained for four hundred years throughout all the revolutions of worldly empire, under the Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman dominion, settled in every city of these vast empires, retaining their own laws, manners, and religion. Their learned men became the friends, counselors, and companions of Princes. Thus did they become more emphatically and universally than when in their own land, the witnesses of Jehovah to all the world. Thus were all the sublime doctrines of the Old Testament brought within the reach and knowledge of all who chose to enquire concerning them.

Of course it is impossible to determine the precise effect which the Jewish religion and people exerted upon the opinions, speculations, and popular feeling of those ages. Certain it is that this testimony of God's chosen witnesses existed, teaching to the reflecting few a sublimer and purer faith. And this is the point which Mr. Hardwick, in the volume which we have placed at the head of our pages, has with much learning discussed. His testimony to the influence of civilization upon the Religions of Asia is especially valuable. There are some well attested facts showing the influence of the Old Testament upon the religious sentiments of mankind. The religious system which the celebrated and learned Zoroaster (the second of that name) engrafted upon the ancient Magian superstition derives all its peculiarities and its excellencies directly from the Mosaic code. The system of this distinguished reformer teaches the unity of God, the immortality of the soul, the existence of good and evil angels—and in its external forms it is almost a literal copy of the Mosaic Institution. But in accommodation to the ancient superstition of the Magian sect, it teaches that light or fire is the Shekinah of the Divine Presence; and it inculcates the worship of that element. Though many of its precepts are severely moral, yet, like every other idolatrous system, it not only permits but encourages the most unnatural incest and other crimes of sensuality.

That all that is true and valuable in the institution of this eminent impostor is copied from that of Moses, is evident from the internal resemblance between the two, and from the fact that the Persian reformer lived in the reign of Darius Hystaspes, immediately after the return of the Jews from their captivity; and when the religion they professed had attracted universal attention throughout the East, on account of a concurrence of remarkable circumstances. The unlimited sovereignty and the almighty power of the God of Daniel had been successively acknowledged and solemnly proclaimed to

all the world by the three most potent and distinguished claimants of universal empire, Nebuchadnezzar, Darius, and Cyrus. At this juncture arose the sage, the reformer, and the pretended prophet, Zoroaster. This man is supposed to have been a Jew, a servant of the Prophet Daniel, who, seeing the glory which his master had acquired as the prophet of the true God, determined to establish for himself an equal reputation, by assuming that character. The principle upon which he proceeded of engrafting the religion taught by Moses upon the most ancient superstition of the East, has been already described. Many of the principles of the motley system thus formed are sublime and imposing, and the whole scheme is the best conceived system of imposture ever given to the world, and the best adapted to promote the interests and the cause of humanity. This great advance and improvement in the principles of the prevailing religion of the East is one direct and manifest result of the testimony borne by the Jewish nation to the truth committed to their keeping.

The influence of the same testimony was not less certainly exerted on the theology and philosophy of the West. As we have said, the earliest civilization of Greece proceeded from Egypt and Phenicia. In after times, it is well known, that the sages and philosophers of that country uniformly visited Egypt and the East in search of Divine wisdom. Can it be supposed that Thales learned from the stupid worshipers of dogs and cats his remarkable saying, "that water was the origin of all things, but God the mind which formed all things from it?" By common consent Pythagoras is regarded as the true founder of Grecian philosophy. The lofty spiritualism, and the pure morality of his system, long influenced the world. He it was who gave to his countrymen those beautiful conceptions of the Divine nature, and of the immortality of the human soul, which by the rich and speculative genius of Plato were subsequently wrought into so many enchanting forms. Whence did Pythagoras obtain these sublime conceptions? He resided in Egypt, and traversed the East in search of wisdom, at the very time when the Jewish nation had been rendered most illustrious by those signal interventions of the Almighty which occasioned the decree of Cyrus for their restoration to their own land. It is said, also, that Pythagoras was the friend and the pupil of Zoroaster. Do we not perceive now the undoubted source of all those grand and beautiful speculations which illustrated the schools of Ionia and of Greece, and which again were reproduced by the poets and the philosophers of Rome? It was the same Divine truth which had been at first revealed to the Patriarchs, which was proclaimed anew from amidst the thunders of Mt. Sinai, which

the Prophets of God had for ages been commissioned to unfold to His people, and which that people had been appointed to testify to the whole world. In the unsearchable counsels of the Divine wisdom, the time had not yet come for the calling of the Gentiles to be a constituent part of the Church of God. But the gracious truth so revealed, and thus diffused, became a great light to irradiate the darkness of the heathen world; and the salt of the earth to preserve poor humanity from utter and irremediable corruption.

From this general survey of the true Religion, and of its principal corruptions from the Fall to the Coming of Christ, we learn, that, however at any time men may have been wanting to themselves, God has never been wanting to them. He has never utterly abandoned humanity to the effects of its own devices. The boasted Light of Nature has never been alone in its teachings; but has always received the coöperation of a Supernatural and Divine assistance.

The institution of Sacrifice, however perverted, has always borne witness to the great truth which it was appointed to express. In the popular religion of every nation there have been some traces of primitive teaching. And God has ever provided that an *external testimony to the whole uncorrupt truth should be presented, directly or indirectly, to all men.* To every man, also, He has given a portion of His Holy Spirit, by whose Divine influences applying the truth thus communicated, a right conscience may have been formed in every man, which was to him as the voice of God, directing him in the way wherein he should go.

Who shall deny, that by this Divine intervention between man and his corruptions, many noble and ingenuous souls in the worst days of heathenism have been sanctified, and prepared for the vision of God, and for the bliss of heaven? We know, alas! that with the mass of men, testimonies of God, and the strivings of the spirit, retarded, but did not stop, the progress of corruption. We know, too, that the increasing light of science only exposed the grossness of the superstitions by which religion had been overlaid. The golden age of Grecian and Roman learning was an age of the most stupendous wickedness which had been exhibited on the earth since the flood. This was the appointed time for the coming of the Messiah, when human nature having attained the summit of its natural capacity, had descended to the lowest point of degradation and vileness. Then CHRIST came; that it might be most truly fulfilled, "The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up."



## BOOK NOTICES.

PHILOLOGICAL STUDIES WITH ENGLISH ILLUSTRATIONS. By JOSIAH W. GIBBS, Prof. Sac. Liter., Yale College. 12mo. pp. 244. New Haven: Durrie & Peck.

One object of the author of this little volume is to exhibit the syntactical peculiarities of Kühner's Latin and Greek grammars, as opposed to the common classic grammars of an earlier origin. Kühner presupposes Becker's system to be known. He introduces Becker's principles, but in so detached a form as often to pass unnoticed by the student of the English translation, having been hardly appreciated by the English translator himself. These principles are here brought together in their connection. Those who would thoroughly understand Kühner are referred to this book.

A higher object of the writer is to lead the English mind into the philosophy of language without going through Latin and Grecian porticos. It is now generally admitted that the philosophy of language can be understood, felt, appreciated, only in one's vernacular tongue. Many are panting for this knowledge, who cannot afford to become catechumens, to the three orders of catechists, especially as the subject lies before them at their own domicils. To such we commend the diligent study of this work.

Another object of the writer is to bring grammar into harmony with logic. These sciences have long been divorced from each other by a difference of phraseology. The writer mediates between them by constantly keeping in view the parallelism of thought and expression, and by adopting a common technology for both these branches of knowledge.

The author aims under each head to begin right or to lay a proper foundation, and thus promote the object of general education. Each topic grows and expands, and might be extended perhaps indefinitely. If the foundation is rightly laid, it is much more easy to build thereon.

So much for the general relations of the philology contained in this volume. It is unnecessary for us to describe its special characteristics, as the author himself has exhibited them in Articles II and III.

We shall now let the work speak for itself.

Our first extract respects the government of verbs.

1. Subjective verbs, as their meaning is complete in themselves, require no complementary object: as '*John sleeps*,' '*Henry stands*.' They admit freely, however, like other verbs, supplementary or incidental objects.

2. Objective verbs, in order to develop their full meaning, require a complementary object after them. Thus

(1.) Some objective verbs, in order to develop their full meaning, require an *accusative* object, i. e. an object merely passive; as, '*they eat bread*,' '*God created the world*.' This is expressed in English by the objective case.

(2.) Some objective verbs, for the same reason, require a *dative* object, i. e. a personal object, also reciprocating the action of the subject, and interested therein; as, '*they yielded to the enemy*,' '*he gave the book to John*.' This is usually expressed in English by means of the preposition *to* or *for*.

(3.) Some objective verbs, for the same reason, require a *genitive* object, i. e. a real object, also acting on the subject, and calling out his activity; as, '*he repents of his folly*,' '*he is ashamed of his conduct*.' This is usually expressed in English by means of the preposition *of* or *from*.

(4.) Some objective verbs, for the same reason, require a *factitive* object, i. e. an object produced by the action of the verb on the accusative or merely pas-

sive object; as, 'they chose him king;' 'he was thought a tyrant.' This is usually expressed in English by a noun in apposition.

Some verbs have two of these objects at the same time; as, 'he gave the book to him;' 'they appointed him chairman.'

These are supposed to be all the complementary or necessary objects.

3. Verbs, whether subjective or objective, admit without discrimination all the supplementary or incidental objects. Thus

(1.) Any verb admits an object of locality; as, 'the ball rolls on the ground;' 'they wounded him in the street.'

(2.) Any verb admits the object of time; as, 'he died in the winter;' 'they summoned him yesterday.'

(3.) Any verb admits the object of manner; as, 'he lived happily;' 'he wrote the letter quickly.'

(4.) Any verb admits the causal object; as, 'he died from poison;' 'he shunned them from fear.'

The same verb may admit several or even all of these supplementary objects; as, 'in the morning the enemy was quickly driven from the field by our guns.'

The varieties of these supplementary objects are almost endless.

The same external form is often used to express very different objects; as, 'he fought for his king,' with a dative object; 'he contended for the prize,' with a genitive object; 'he was taken for a rogue,' with a factitive object; 'I contended for an hour,' with a supplementary object of time." pp. 107, 108.

This happy and lucid statement, although adapted to the English language, has a much more important bearing on the Latin and Greek, as explaining the internal nature of the dative, genitive, and factitive relations.

Our second extract respects the relation of the conjunctions *for* and *because*. "The same thought or sentiment, standing in a given logical relation to another thought or sentiment, may oftentimes be expressed either coordinately or subordinately, at the will of the speaker; as, *Marcus laudatur, nam hostes vicit*, 'Marcus is praised, for he conquered the enemies;' and *Marcus laudatur, quia hostes vicit*, 'Marcus is praised, because he conquered the enemies.' In the former case the additional clause acquires importance, in the latter the causality is made emphatic.

The distinction between Eng. *for* and *because* is essentially the same as that between Gr. *yâp* and *êti*, or that between Lat. *nam* and *quia*, or that between Germ. *denn* and *weil*," p. 116.

This short paragraph states an important fact for four languages at once.

After explaining in a philosophical manner the different kinds of causes on pages 126-130, our author appends the following note:

"Cause is one of the simplest and most familiar conceptions of the human mind. It has its origin in internal experience, that is, in the consciousness of volition and action; and is afterwards applied to external things.

The numerous and complicated forms which the cause assumes, may be illustrated thus.

A clerk is dependent on his salary for his support. We may say of him,

'He lays up money, because he is prudent in his expenditures.' Proper cause, or actual real ground.

'He is prudent in his expenditures, because he lays up money.' Reason, or actual-moral ground.

'He should lay up money, because he has a good salary.' Motive, or actual moral ground.

'He will lay up money, if he is prudent in his expenditures.' Condition, or possible ground.

'He lays up money, although he has not a good salary.' Concession, or adversative ground.

'He is prudent in his expenditures, in order that he may lay up money.' Purpose, or ultimate ground" pp. 130, 131.

We probably knew all this before, but the author has brought it to consciousness. We do not remember having seen any such summary.

Our last extract will respect the collocation of the substantive and attribute in English.

"The attribute precedes the substantive; as, 'good men.' This is contrary to the logical order. So whenever the attribute is a single word, and readily receives the stress of voice. But whenever the attribute is extended so as not to receive the stress of voice, the logical order is restored; as, 'a mind *conscious of right*;' 'a wall *three feet thick*;' 'a woman, *modest, sensible, and virtuous*;' 'a being *infinitely wise*.' So in poetry; 'to the isles *Atlantic*;' and in many technical terms; as, 'their *presumptive*;' 'notary *public*.' p. 113.

Here not only the facts are given, but the reasons of the facts also; so that the whole is remembered at once.

This form of philology is not exactly new, even on English soil. Dr. J. D. Morell, well known for his philosophical writings, and one of Queen Victoria's Inspectors of Schools, has recommended the principles of Becker to the pupils of British schools. Prof. Fowler of Amherst, in his English Grammar, has several chapters based on Becker. In New Haven, classes of young ladies have been taught in this way. In Yale College, several of the Academical Professors have written and lectured on these new views. The Germans of Cincinnati have republished in that city, for the benefit of their youth, a German grammar on the Beckerian plan. And many individuals in all parts of our country, are desirous to understand the subject more perfectly. This work, we think, cannot fail to be appreciated.

THE NEW ENGLAND HISTORY, from the Discovery of the Continent by the Northmen, A. D. 986, to the period when the Colonies declared their Independence, A. D. 1776. By CHARLES W. ELLIOTT. In two volumes. New York: Charles Scribner. 1857. 8vo. pp. 479, 492.

Of these two large, well-printed volumes of Mr. C. W. Elliott, we regret to speak without more room to justify our judgment. They are, apparently, written from the stand-point of a modern progressionist, who, with no faith in the past, dazzles and deludes the masses with his airy castles. These men are great eulogizers of the Puritans, from whom most of them descended; yet their Puritanism, like the Play of Macbeth with Macbeth left out, is a somewhat different thing from the genuine article. We quote, almost at random, a few passages, which show how far we may rely on the accuracy, and which also exhibit the temper and spirit of the author:

"Whether Bluff Harry or Pious Paul should be Pope in England! \* \* \* In the struggle, the weaker went down, and England, cut loose from Rome, set up for herself, with Henry as her *spiritual* head." Vol. I, p. 39.

"Archbishop Tindal had appealed, not to the Pope, or to Councils, or to the King, but to the Bible. So did Latimer; so did the Riddleys; so did Cranmer; so did Bradford." *Ib.* p. 189.

"Down they went before the tempest they had raised—first went Wentworth, then Laud, and then Charles himself, victims of their own folly, *infidelity*, and love of despotism. Liberty raised its head, and for a time Puritanism triumphed. Kings, *Bishops*, and Courtiers, discovered that they, too, had a joint in their necks, and the lesson then taught, the world has never forgot." *Ib.* p. 195.

"The truth seems to be, that the Puritans represented the movement party in England, and the bitter persecutions they met with, were owing, not to their objections to surplices and ceremonials, but to their persistent protest and resistance to abuses in the Church; which men in place knew well would in the end destroy their places and limit or destroy their privileges. They were feared and hated as the Re-Formers of that day." *Ib.* p. 44.

Neither has Mr. Elliott done full justice to the stern doctrines, or stiff and

sturdy virtues of the old Puritans themselves. None but a Churchman, of the same stock from which they sprung, can measure and mark their life and power.

In the author's description of Puritan Doctrines, habits of thinking, of the "Revival" in the 18th century, &c., we find him grappling with great truths, social questions and historical verities, on which we differ from him at almost every step in his discussion. There are few topics connected with the history of the New England Colonies, down to the time of the Declaration of Independence, external or internal, their government, wars, manners, literature, industry and progress, which he does not touch. He has evidently been industrious as a reader, and his style, as a narrator, is always lively; yet the anecdotes, the odds and ends of stupid poetry and dull stories, seem hardly suited to the dignity of history, though they illustrate the manners and habits of the people.

The writer, in his Conclusion, in summing up the results to which he has come, says, that "he has little reverence for the past there [in New England] or elsewhere," and this is really the key-note to his whole work. Christianity, in any form, as the great, living, supernatural, social power, which is to regenerate the world, he has, apparently, little conception of, or reverence for, at least in this aspect of it. His philosophy culminates in a mere faith in Man—not Faith in Christ. He does say that "the town-house and school-house should stand side by side;" but the Church of Christ would, evidently, be, to him at best, a superfluity. If, in his conception of what constitutes a State, he rises above the level of the grossest Materialism; or has more substance than the sublimated moonshine of modern Transcendentalism, he yet has no eye for those great Verities which underlie all the well-being, and true progress of Society; which Washington enunciated, again and again, in his official papers; and which Mr. Bancroft, in his later volumes, has so forcibly presented. We do not, as our readers know, profess to be special admirers of New England Puritanism. At any rate, our admiration was never charged with idolatry. But we dislike to see imperfect conceptions and descriptions labeled as genuine history, be the subject what it may; and as an American, we must protest against all unchristian theories of national life and progress, for the end of such theories it needs no Seer's eye to discern.

BACON'S ESSAYS: With Annotations. By RICHARD WHATELY, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. From the second London edition, revised. New York: C. S. Francis & Co. 1857. 8vo. pp. 536.

The principal value of this edition of Bacon's Essays lies in the fact, that it will direct attention to the immortal work of LORD BACON, rather than in the intrinsic merit of Archbishop Whately's Annotations. For the contrast between Bacon and Whately, is as great as it well can be. One is laconic, the other is diffuse. One is suggestive, the other is rambling and often superfluous. One is stately, the other is slipshod. These "Essays" are now almost the only one of LORD BACON's works which continues to be popular. The great work of his life, which revolutionized the Philosophy of Physical Science, his "*Instauratio Magna*," and especially its Second Part, the "*Novum Organum*," has grown obsolete with the disappearance of the evils which it sought to remedy, or did remedy; or with the substitution of the *inductive*, for the *deductive* method of reasoning. In the domain of Physics, all inquiry is now conducted on the rules laid down in the code enunciated by Bacon; though modified, somewhat, by subsequent experience and observation. How far the inductive method pertains to *morals*, political, ethical and moral, is now the great question of the day; and on which there is, we suppose, more looseness, or diversity of opinion, and among sound Churchmen, too, than is generally supposed. But the "Essays" in this volume are of a different character. They are not so much Essays, in the modern sense of the word, as the aphorisms and reflections of a profound genius, which pertain to actual life in all its forms, at home and abroad, among the noble and the ignoble, at the bar, the court, and in parliament; in short, as Bacon says, they treat of subjects which "come home to men's business and bosoms." The explanations, in foot-notes, of obsolete words and phrases, by an unknown

hand, is a valuable feature of the edition. But Whately's Annotations are prolix and often commonplace; frequently being nothing more than references to, and quotations from, his own works. Thus Bacon's Essay XXIV, consists of two pages; Whately's Annotations cover nineteen pages; or we have one part of Bacon, to about ten parts of Whately. But the Archbishop has one decided hit; and we agree with him, that the study of Bacon would be a good antidote to one of the worst faults of our popular and Church literature. The bantling was cradled in Germany, and has been nurtured by a few transcendental dreamers in our own country, and in England. It is misty, foggy, muddy and shallow, but amazingly pretentious, and wears very mysterious airs. The Archbishop thus tells the story. "Many a work of this description may remind one of the supposed ancient shield which had been found by the antiquary Martinus Scriblerus, and which he highly prized, incrustated as it was with venerable rust. He mused on the splendid appearance it must have had in its bright newness; till, one day, an over-sedulous house-maid having scoured off the rust, it turned out to be merely an old pot-lid." It may induce some one to study Bacon, if we add, that the profoundest American Statesman now living,—we so regard him,—has long made Bacon's Essays his daily companion, instead of gorging himself with the miserable wishy-washy stuff poured forth from our popular press.

LIFE OF PRINCE TALLEYRAND; with Extracts from his Speeches and Writings. By CHARLES K. MCHARG. New York: C. Scribner. 1857. 12mo. pp. 382.

We do not expect to see a better "Life" than this of Talleyrand, until A. D. 1868, when the "thirty years" from his death shall have expired; and his Autobiography will then be published. Nor will the verdict, already rendered upon him, then be set aside. With here and there a solitary worshiper and an imitator, there is no public altar to such men as Talleyrand. His life and character are embalmed in loathing and infamy, and are studied only to be execrated. Of noble birth; wearing an impenetrable countenance and gifted with the most polished manners; trained to sophistry and hypocrisy in the best Romish schools; hating a Christianity which he saw, only as a corrupt imposition, and an outrageous tyranny; kneeling at the shrine of that cold-blooded blasphemer, Voltaire, even while priestly vows were on him, and the reversion of a Bishopric had been secured for him; renouncing his Episcopal office at the last, not because he found in it the least restraint upon his gross animal passions, but because it exposed him to personal dangers, and fettered his boundless ambition; utterly unprincipled, debauched, and depraved, in mind and heart; exasperated by early family injustice into a feeling of bitter and lifelong resentment; possessing, by nature, every art of dissimulation; venal, crafty, unscrupulous; endowed with a most subtle and powerful intellect; knowing the secret springs to move men's wills in subservience to his own; with a career which reached from the French Revolution to the enthronement of Louis Phillippe, and which embraced the horrors of the "Reign of Terror" and the splendid drama of Napoleon's entire life; by his adroit management, playing into the hands, alike, of the Revolutionists, of The Directory, of Napoleon, Louis XVIII, and of Louis Phillippe; filling, and without being once eclipsed or overshadowed, the very highest Offices under these successive Governments; brought into immediate conflict with the first statesmen of Europe, Pitt, and Fox, and Sheridan, and awing them with his power; driven by the Alien Law from England, as a disturber of the public peace, to the United States, where, by his intrigues, he sought to embarrass Washington's Administration—throughout his whole public career, of more than sixty years, he fairly earned the reputation of the "Prince of Diplomats." He was at once, one of the greatest and the meanest, of all mankind. His own favorite maxim depicts the man: "Nothing succeeds so well as success." He died in 1838.

Mr. McHarg, the author of his Life, has done his work exceedingly well. He has, apparently, exhausted all accessible materials; and, at present, nothing better on the subject can be looked for.

**DESIGNS FOR PARISH CHURCHES IN THE THREE STYLES OF ENGLISH CHURCH ARCHITECTURE**; With an Analysis of each Style, a Review of the Nomenclature of the Periods of English Gothic Architecture, and some remarks introductory to Church building. Exemplified in a series of over one hundred Illustrations. By J. COLEMAN HART, Architect. New York: Dana & Co. 1857. 8vo. pp. 108.

In the Oct. No. of our Third Volume, in reviewing Will's "Ancient Ecclesiastical Architecture," we laid down three principles, which embrace the fundamentals of Christian Architecture, and noticed briefly the history of Church Architecture in England; first, Saxon; then, Norman; then, Pointed; and examined the three different Styles of what is usually regarded as true Church Architecture. The absolute impossibility of marking, with perfect accuracy, the historical transitions from one Style to another; the blending of Early Decorated, and Perpendicular, and even of Norman, Italian, Greek, and Egyptian, in one hideous composition which we occasionally witness, and we need not go far for an illustration; the utter confusion in which our modern Ecclesiologists have thrown the whole subject of architectural classification and nomenclature; the miserable, ugly, graceless, barns and factories which are called "Churches" on the one hand, and the elaborated symbolism of full-blown Popery on the other, which we see in some new Churches in our own Communion; the mingled ignorance, and conceit, and ultimate mortification, with which large sums have been and still are squandered on Christian edifices,—all these, attest the theoretical and practical difficulties which Church Architecture has to contend with in our country; where, indeed, both as a Science and an Art, it is yet in its infancy.

Mr. Hart's work is sensible and valuable. His introduction presents a cursory glance at details common to Churches of all styles and orders; and he then takes up the Early English, the Decorated English, and the Perpendicular English, Gothic Architecture, in which nomenclature he follows Rickman, and gives elaborated views and plans, perspective and geometric, of each of the three styles, with a minute, descriptive analysis of each, in letter-press. We commend the book to a wide circulation, for it will do much to educate the mind of the Church up to a truer conception of certain great principles not arbitrary but eternal; and not less real, because not recognized and appreciated, by a gross materialism, or a false philosophy. We may sneer at Ecclesiology as much as we please; the rapid advance of aesthetic culture in this country forces the subject upon us. Only let us be careful, that the established rules of Art are made to harmonize with the true, Primitive, Catholicity of the Church's Faith and Worship. The Church wants neither Romish pagodas, nor Puritan conventicles; but she does want, and she yet will have, high Art, embodying and teaching the deep mysteries of the Christian System as she receives them.

**THE CONSTITUTIONAL TEXT BOOK: A Practical and Familiar Exposition of the Constitution of the United States, and of portions of the Public and Administrative Law of the Federal Government.** Designed chiefly for the use of Schools, Academies, and Colleges. By FURMAN SHEPPARD. Philadelphia. 1857. 12mo. pp. 324. New Haven: F. T. Jarman.

A more complete handbook on our Federal Government has never appeared. Besides containing several important documents, as the Declaration of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, Washington's Farewell Address, the Constitution of the United States, and the Articles in addition to the Constitution, the author has prefixed to the work a brief history of the Colonial Governments, and of the various steps to the adoption of the Constitution. He then takes up, section by section, and clause by clause, the Constitution itself; and subjects each to a close examination. The Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Powers are clearly defined, as to their nature, extent, and modes of action.

We wish an examination upon this book was required in all our Colleges, and all our High Schools. What we need, now, emphatically, is a National Education; and with that, a love of country; and then, Loyalty and Obedience,



enforced as a religious obligation. There would be fewer traitors in the pulpit and out of it, and fewer pretexts for them to make mischief with.

PAST MERIDIAN. By Mrs. L. H. SIGOURNEY. Third Edition. Hartford, Conn.: F. A. BROWN. 1857. 12mo. pp. 344.

We are glad to greet with a warm welcome the third edition of this beautiful work of our world-wide known, and universally loved, poetess. For it is, indeed, "a thing of beauty," and so it will be "a joy forever." It is beautiful, in its conception; beautiful, in its expression; beautiful, in its pure and noble sentiment; beautiful, in its practical, yet sublime Christian philosophy. Guided by her own wide observation, and extended reading, and may we not say, her own rich experience, her pen delights to throw the rich, warm, mellow glow of hope, and joy, and peace, upon the shadows which gather around the evening twilight of human life. It is so womanly and truthful, so elevating and instructive, so genial and Christian in its tone, that we pronounce it the very best of all the numerous works with which Mrs. Sigourney has enriched our American literature.

EXAMPLES FROM THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES. By Mrs. L. H. SIGOURNEY. First Series. New York: C. Scribner. 1857. 12mo. pp. 349.

These literary portraits are worthy of the graceful pen of the authoress. In another Number we hope to pay a more worthy tribute to her rare worth.

ARCTIC ADVENTURE BY SEA AND LAND, from the Earliest Date to the Last Expedition in Search of Sir John Franklin. Edited by EPES SARGENT. With Maps and Illustrations. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1857. 12mo. pp. 480.

A compendious and reliable history of "Arctic Adventure" from the first will prove a valuable direction to the spirit of enquiry now aroused by the mystery which hangs around the fate of Sir John Franklin, and by the chivalric labors and lamented end of Dr. Kane. Such a work, is this of Mr. Sargent. The exploits of the Northmen in the ninth and tenth centuries; the settlements in Nova Scotia and Greenland, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; the explorations in the 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th centuries, by Portuguese, Spaniards, French, Danes, Dutch, English, and Russians; all these are almost forgotten; as are the daring, and the suffering, of such men as Gaspar Cortereal, and Miguel, and Sir Hugh Willoughby, and Sir Humphrey Gilbert, and Davis, and Barentz, and Henry Hudson, and Behring, and Ross, and Parry. The volume contains a fine map; and the tracing of the course of these and subsequent voyagers by this map will give all the geographical knowledge of the Arctic regions now attainable. Not a particle of sympathy has been excited for our own noble Kane, which was not justly due; but let us not forget the debt which we owe to those whom we are pleased to call the "rude" adventurers of an earlier day.

EXPLORATIONS AND ADVENTURES IN HONDURAS, comprising Sketches and Travel in the Gold Region of Olancho; and a Review of the history and General Resources of Central America, with original maps. By W. V. WELLS. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 8vo. pp. 588. New Haven: E. Downes.

We have another illustration, in this volume by Mr. Wells, of the influence of commerce and the industrial arts of modern times, in promoting geographical science and the spread of civilization. The author visited Honduras in 1854, to obtain certain mining and commercial privileges from the government of the country. The unsettled state of affairs has, we suppose, thwarted, at least for the present, the special objects of his journey. But during the year of his residence, he consulted old Spanish and other authors on the early history of the Spanish Central American colonies, and shows that much of the mystery, which even Prescott and Irving have not yet solved, may yet be cleared up. He also visited the most important parts of Honduras, and his map of Yoro and

Olancho is, we believe, the only reliable one of the Eastern part of the country. His description of the natural resources of the country, his sketch of the history of the five Central American States, and his views of the life, manners, habits, morals, and religion of the people, will be read with avidity. It is a wonderful country, and is, within the next fifty years, to be the theatre of stirring events. Its geographical position, offering the most desirable route for inter-oceanic communication; its brilliant landscapes; its broad plateaus, with their bracing air and sky of more than Italian beauty; its exhaustless mineral wealth; and its soil, which might make it the garden of the world—all these mark Central America as designed for the home of a great and noble people. The signal failures of all attempts at self-government since the Spanish yoke was thrown off in 1821, open up social problems, and demonstrate certain religious and political truths which can hardly fail to be appreciated.

**THE LENTEN SEASON:** Discourses on Retirement and Self-Denial; selected from the works of the most eminent English Divines of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. From the last London Edition. New York: T. H. Stanford. 1857. 12mo. pp. 356. New Haven: S. Babcock.

This volume came to hand too late for the last Lenten Season; but the solid learning, the deep-toned orthodoxy, the fervent spirituality, the manly vigor, of these Sermons, adapt them to all times and seasons. Secker, Hall, Leighton, Atterbury, South, Farinon, Taylor, Tillotson, Barrow, Beveridge, Horsley, Donne, Clarke, Wesley, and Watts—each contribute a discourse to this well selected volume. The Introductory Essay is a well-reasoned argument for that self-discipline which underlies and conditions all spiritual strength and progress.

**A THREE-FOLD TEST OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM.** By WILLIAM R. GORDON, D. D. New York: C. Scribner. 1856. 12mo. pp. 408.

Whether a Rev. Doctor of Divinity has done a wise thing in devoting so much attention to "Modern Spiritualism," we do not pretend to decide. He intimates, that its reception by men of acknowledged ability, and the inroads of this scheme or system on Methodism, first called his attention seriously to it; many of the members, and several ministers of that denomination, having embraced it. His "three-fold test" is Experience, Internal Evidence, and the Bible; and the results of that test, he gives at great length, and his Scriptural argument is very strong and very well put. His conclusion is, that this whole thing is the work of a *spiritual agency*, in other words, the work of Satan; who, "in the latter days," was to come "with all deceivableness." Such a perfect fardel of nonsense, contradictions, heathenism, blasphemy, concentrated and bitter hatred of CHRIST and His Church, as we find here attributed to these "mediums," is certainly worthy only of Satan; and St. Paul's description of those who give "heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils," is a sufficient guide for all Churchmen, as to their own duty in the matter. And yet, when we see how many of the professed teachers of Christianity, in our times, are giving up the Gospel and the Church of CHRIST, and are turning their "Churches" into political club-rooms, or play-houses, and then boast, *Barnum-like*, how well it "pays," (an unanswerable argument now a days,) we need hardly be surprised at Modern Spiritualism, or any other similar development.

**PAUL FANE: or Parts of a Life else untold.** A Novel. By N. PARKER WILLIS. New York: C. Scribner. 1857. 12mo. pp. 402.

We have not read enough of the late works of N. P. Willis, to know whether this Novel is an original, or a copy. But his talent is of a higher order; he writes better, has more feeling, more true sentiment, more æsthetic culture, more genuine power of appreciating the deeper undercurrents of the soul, whose "life" is, indeed, "untold," than we supposed. There is in him, however, as

there is in the author of "Lady Alice," an apparently irresistible tendency towards not only the sensuous, but the sensual. These offensive delineations of female beauty, the "nudities" and "little inequalities," &c., &c., where the writer's pen perpetually revels, might pass well enough in a Turkish seraglio, or a Socialist phalanstery, or at a "free-love" carnival; but all the sneers at prudery in the world, cannot save them from revealing the taste of the writer, or shield them from the condemnation of an indignant, high-toned morality.

LETTER à Monseigneur Parisis, Eveque d' Arras, sur les Erreurs Historiques qui existent dans la Communion Romaine à l'égard de l'Eglise Anglicane; par le Rév. A. C. COXE, M. A., Rector de Gracechurch, à Baltimore. 1856.

We are happy to call attention to this contribution from Mr. Coxe, in behalf of the "Association for making known upon the Continent the Principles of the Anglican Church." It is a translation of the "Letters of the Bishop of Arras," and is well adapted to promote the objects of the Association. We are more and more convinced that this Association is one of the most important Church instrumentalities of the day. It has authority and character. Among the fourteen Bishops who are its patrons, are the Bishops of Exeter, Oxford, and Salisbury, as representing the Church of England at home; the Bishops of Capetown and Natal, as standing for the Colonial Church; the Bishops of Glasgow, and Moray and Ross, for the Church of Scotland; and the Bishop of Maryland, for the American Church. The Committee is composed of Clergymen and Laymen of high standing. Among the former are the Venerable Archdeacon Churton, the late lamented Professor Hussey, and the Rev. Canon Wordsworth; among the latter, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Markland, and Mr. Roundell Palmer. The field is evidently ripening for such labors. The facts revealed in Mr. Coxe's "Sympathies of the Continent," and the confessions of the Romish dignitary, Prof. Hirscher; the wide-spread, and deep uneasiness in France and Italy, and indeed in all Europe, under the new Dogma, which every week more and more reveals; the awful criminalities, and utter rottenness, in the high places of the Romish Church, which the assassin Verger asked and threatened to disclose, and which are now known to be realities; these, and similar facts, are full of meaning. Nor is this all. The Association, above alluded to, is already beginning to reap the fruits of its labors. The London *Colonial Church Chronicle*, for April, contains two Letters from a French Abbé, who is a convert to true Catholicity, by the reading of the Society's publications. He says, "Among all the Reformed Churches, the Anglican Church is, without doubt, that which approaches nearest to the Primitive Churches of Christianity, in all that concerns the hierarchy, discipline, form of Public Worship, &c. \* \* \* \* Until it is judged proper to entrust me with the work of the Ministry, I have determined to enter the Anglican Church as a simple layman."

Infidelity in Italy among the higher classes, is believed to be nearly universal. A Protestant Pastor in Turin, Rev. Mr. Meille, lately said: "Rome has done great evil to Italy, by making the nation believe that there is no other Christianity in the world than Roman Catholicism, nor any other revealed doctrine than that of which the Pope is the dispenser. . . . The Bible is also almost as unknown in Italy as the books of Confucius and Buddha. . . . From this it results that many persons, chiefly among men of intelligence, disgusted by a religion like that of Rome, and knowing no other, plunge into skepticism."

THE SATIRES OF JUVENAL AND PERSIUS, with English Notes, Critical and Explanatory, from the best Commentators. By CHARLES ANTHON, LL. D., Professor, &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 12mo. pp. 306. New Haven: E. Downes.

A good edition of Juvenal, so purged of gross indelicacies as to be fit for perusal and recitation, and well furnished with explanatory notes and comments has long been a desideratum. The present edition meets that want. It bears the marks everywhere, of Prof. Anthon's scholarship, acumen, and industry;

and will be welcomed by those who see in the study of the ancient Classics, one of the best antidotes to the noisy, impudent sciolism of the day.

The Satires of Persius are given without note or comment.

THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMS. Scriptural Examination of the questions respecting I, The Translation of Baptizo. II, The Mode of Baptism. III, The Subjects of Baptism. By GEO. D. ARMSTRONG, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Norfolk, Va. New York: C. Scribner. 1857. 12mo. pp. 322. New Haven: F. T. Jarman.

We have rarely seen a work on Baptism, at once so thorough and satisfactory, and yet, so well designed for popular use. As a refutation of the Baptist notions, both as to the meaning of the word *baptizo*, and the proper *mode*, and *subjects*, of Baptism, the argument is unanswerable. We are surprised, too, and delighted at the orthodoxy of the writer, as to the *nature* of Baptism. The membership of baptized children in the Church, and the ends and purposes of that membership, are stated with a Scriptural fidelity which we should like to see imitated in some other quarters in Virginia. If it must be left to Presbyterians to adhere to, and defend, such vital principles as this, to them we must yield the strength and the victory which such principles will certainly win; for they take hold of human nature in its true character, and grasp the very elements which form the constitution of the social state. We have some rich things in store on the Baptist controversy, which we only want a good opportunity to bring out.

RANDOM SKETCHES AND NOTES OF EUROPEAN TRAVEL IN 1856. By REV. JOHN E. EDWARDS, A. M. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 12mo. pp. 456. New Haven: E. Downes.

Mr. Edwards, a Presbyterian Minister, at Richmond, Va., has, doubtless, gratified his friends in publishing these "Random Sketches and surface views," taken in a hurried visit to places and scenes, with which the most ordinary reader is tolerably familiar. His attempted criticisms upon the noblest works of Art show an unpracticed eye; and the choral Service of the English Cathedrals, by which many an American Congregationalist and Presbyterian has confessed himself sweetly subdued and melted into tenderness—even this, Mr. Edwards pronounces "a most ridiculous and farcical affair." Such travelers are to be pitied, rather than blamed.

CHARACTERS AND CRITICISMS. By W. ALFRED JONES, A. M. Two volumes. New York: J. Y. Westervelt. 1857. 12mo. pp. 289, 268.

These literary papers, in all more than eighty in number, were contributed to several Periodicals, between the years 1838 and 1845. They cover a wide range of literature; the criticisms, on books and authors, are always generous in tone; often, more than usually discriminating; and are always written in a quiet elevation and smoothness of style, which indicates the man of culture and refinement. The work is dedicated to that ripe scholar and rare man, C. MOORE, LL. D.

A CATALOGUE OF THEOLOGICAL BOOKS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES; including the Sacred Writings, Fathers, Doctors of the Church, Schoolmen and Ecclesiastical Historians, to the death of Boniface VIII, A. D. 1303; Jewish and Rabbinical Commentators; Works of the Reformers; and of the more recent Divines, Ascetical, Dogmatical, Polemical and Exegetical; Liturgies, Rituals, and Liturgical Literature; Councils, Synods, and Confessions of Faith; Monastic History and Rule; Canon and Ecclesiastical Law; Church Polity and Discipline; Hebrew and Syriac Literature, etc., etc. London: David Nutt, 270 Strand; and Trubner & Co., 60 Paternoster Row. 1857. 8vo. pp. 600.

This full title page gives a fair index of the contents of the volume. It is rich in information for scholars, and has evidently been prepared by Mr. Nutt with

great labor and care. The list of the works of the Fathers, Doctors, and Schoolmen, &c., fills *eighty-five* pages; Liturgies and Liturgical Literature, cover more than *forty one* pages; Councils, Synods, Canons, &c., occupy *nineteen* pages. Descriptive notes also are interspersed, containing valuable information. There is not a department of Theological Literature, on which this catalogue does not point to the most reliable works, with full title page, size, date, price, &c., of each. Many of our readers will know how to appreciate such a guide-book. Its price is two dollars.

**THE FLOCK FED:** or Catechetical Instruction preparatory to Confirmation. By the Rev. C. M. BUTLER, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Cincinnati. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 1857. 16mo. pp. 115.

We never see a work like this without a feeling of regret, that they who seem so earnest in teaching one part of the Christian system, should try to separate what God has so unquestionably joined together. What we mean will appear in the following parallel passages:

DR. C. M. BUTLER.

"The view of our Church is, that the Holy Ghost is given to the heart through the hearing of the Word of God, and in answer to prayer; and that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are signs and seals of grace received; and means or instruments of renewing and confirming grace."—pp. 42-3.

PRAYER BOOK.

SACRAMENTS.—"I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."—*Catechism*.

"Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession; but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him."—*Art.* xxv.

**THE CHILD'S BOOK OF NATURE.** Three Parts in One. Part I, Plants; Part II, Animals; Part III, Air, Water, Heat, Light, &c. By WORTHINGTON HOOKER, M. D. Illustrated by numerous Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. Square 12mo. pp. 120, 170, 179. New Haven: E. Downes.

Dr. Hooker, a Professor in Yale College, is an accomplished Naturalist, and a pleasing writer, and he has given a general survey of the kingdom of Nature, in a manner at once to attract and instruct. Those of our older readers who remember "Joyce's Dialogues" will imagine what an agreeable and really useful volume Dr. Hooker has prepared for children. To each chapter, Questions are appended for the use of Schools.

**ISABEL, the Young Wife and the Old Love.** By JOHN CORDY JEAFFERSON. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 12mo. pp. 454. New Haven: E. Downes.

**READING WITHOUT TEARS; Or a Pleasant Mode of learning to read.** By the Author of "Peep of Day." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 16mo. pp. 136. New Haven: E. Downes.

This little book is rightly called "reading without tears," for we venture to say, that no bright little fellow will get a look at it without being strongly provoked to tears, if he is not permitted to read it.

**FIRST SCRIPTURE LESSONS FOR INFANT MINDS.** By MRS. D. P. SANFORD.

**QUESTIONS UPON PORTIONS OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.** By the Rev. ALEX. GLENNIE, Rector of All Saints Parish, Waccamaw, S. C.

QUESTIONS ON THE SUNDAY EVENING LESSONS IN THE CHURCH SERVICE. By a Layman of the Diocese of Connecticut. Series II. From Whitsunday to Advent.

NEW YORK. CHURCH BOOK SOCIETY. 1857. F. D. Harriman, Agent.

There are two cardinal principles which the Church recognizes in all her teaching; and in which she differs from the two opposite habits and modes of thought on the right hand and on the left. One is, that the Gospel is to be received and obeyed, as primarily addressed to our Faith, rather than to our Reason. The other is, the duty of unfolding the truths and duties of the Gospel, and exhibiting their adaptedness to, and claims upon, our intellectual and moral nature. Both these principles are recognized in these three volumes just issued by the Church Book Society. Mrs. Sanford's Questions are prepared with excellent judgment and admirable tact. Mr. Glennie's Questions on the Prayer Book are designed for primary classes, are simple and practical. Mr. Hollister continues the work so well begun, and of which we have already expressed our high appreciation. Himself a thorough scholar, an earnest Biblical Student, and for many years the Superintendent of one of the largest and best conducted Sunday Schools in the Church, these Questions will be found peculiarly adapted to ordinary use in our Sunday Schools.

We are glad to see our Church Book Society at last getting into working order. It can, if it will, win the confidence of the Church, and lift itself above the position of a beggarly charity. But it must redeem its promises, and respond with "deeds," not "words," to the noble generosity with which the Church has been "bled" by its past blunders.

CRIME INCREASING AND OUR SCHOOL TAX WASTED. Newark, N. J. 1857. 8vo. pp. 30.

Who the author of this pamphlet is, we do not know; but we bid him God-speed in his efforts to expose the downright infidelity which in theory underlies our whole Common School System. *Mere intellectual and aesthetic culture, has no power, and no tendency, to prevent or diminish crime.* The author of this pamphlet proves this position, by statistics, and yet it needs no proof to the mind of a sound Churchman. Yet we see no method to do away with our Common School System so munificently endowed, in many of the States; we must make it as Christian as we can, in its practical operation; and above all, we must insist on the most thorough and systematic Christian Nurture of the young by other means and instrumentalities. We confess to feelings of surprise at the ground lately taken on this subject in certain of our Church Periodicals, where we read of sounder and more Christian philosophy. The insane ravings and rantings of the Greeley School, of which the Tribune, rather than the Bible, is the text-book, are to be expected as a matter of course.

THE POCKET BOOK OF DAILY PRIVATE PRAYERS. By REV. D. P. SANFORD, M. A., Rector of the "Church of the Redeemer." New York: T. N. Stanford. 1857. 18mo. pp. 32.

It is no objection to this convenient little Manual that there is in it no meretricious affectation of a quaint and obsolete style; the author taking it for granted, that a man can say his prayers acceptably even in good English; and without the whining cant either of Puritanism or Mediævalism.

HARPER'S STORY BOOKS. No. 30, Orkney. No. 31, Judge Justin. By JACOB ABBOTT. New York: Harper & Brothers. May and June. 1857

MEMOIR OF BENJAMIN HANOVER PUNCHARD, the Founder of the Punchard Free School, Andover, Mass. By Rev. SAMUEL FULLER, D. D. Andover. 1857. 8vo. pp. 43.

A well prepared and well deserved tribute.



**FIFTH ANNUAL REPORTS, &c., of the Missionary and Benevolent Society of St. Paul's Church, New Haven, Ct.**

These Reports give cheering proofs of what a well ordered and vigorous parish can do under the ministrations of an able and effective Rector.

**PARISH STATISTICS of Christ Church, Elizabeth, New Jersey; and Fourth Annual Address of the Rector.**

The Free Church System has certainly been no failure in this Parish; nor, would almost any other, with such a right-earnest and whole-hearted man at its head.

**WHAT "FREE CHURCH" MEANS, AND WHY CHURCHES SHOULD BE FREE.** By Rev. J. H. HOBART BROWN, Rector of the Free Church of the Good Angels, Brooklyn, L. I. 1857.

**Rev. N. H. SCHENCK'S Anniversary Discourse: Christ our Helper.** In Rosse Chapel, Gambier, Ohio, Easter, April 12, 1857.

We find in this Discourse a particular account of a great religious interest in Kenyon College, and of its permanent effects on a large number of students. In the utter neglect of Christian Culture which prevails, and the multitudes of young and old, in all our parishes, living in sin, without God and without hope, the fact of such numbers of sudden and true conversions, under the ordinary Means of Grace faithfully used, ought to be anticipated. The whole subject involves principles of the deepest moment, some of which have been discussed in our pages. Mr. Schenck is an able man; whose spirit of life and energy deserves the sympathy of all true men among us.

**THE MISSIONARY OFFERINGS AT THE ANNIVERSARY of the Sunday School of St. Thomas' Church, New Haven, Conn. With the Rector's Address.** Whitsunday, 1857.

We are glad to see this proof that the new parish of St. Thomas' have inaugurated the only policy which can ensure a healthy increase.

**LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF SCOTLAND and English Princesses Connected with the Royal Succession of Great Britain.** By AGNES STRICKLAND. Vol. VI. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 12mo. pp. 365. New Haven: E. Downes.

The reader will find in this continuation of the history of Mary Stuart, the same excellencies, and the same faults, that appeared in the earlier volumes,—the same animation, warmth and vigor of style, the same minuteness of detail; and also, the same intense sympathy with the unfortunate Queen, and the same persistent attempts to defend her character, private and public, and to the injury of, the Queen of England. It is the most natural thing in the world that Miss Strickland should take the part of a broken-hearted and erring woman against the severity of a stern, State policy, and she imparts to her story all the charm of a romance.

**THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE COLONIES AND FOREIGN DEPENDENCIES OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.** By the Rev. JAMES S. M. ANDERSON, M. A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, Preacher of Lincoln's-inn, Rector of Tormarton, and Honorary Canon of Bristol. In three volumes: London: Rivingtons. 1856. 12mo. pp. 572, 582, 654.

We receive this work as we go to press; and have only room to announce it as a most important contribution to our Church literature, and especially to the history of our own branch of the Church. We shall return to it hereafter.

# ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

## SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

### ORDINATIONS.

#### DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Abel, Alfred M.	Potter, A.	June 7,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Appleton, Edward W.	Potter, A.	May 27,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Appleton, Samuel E.	Potter, A.	May 27,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bonnell, Charles R.	Potter, A.	May 31,	Christ, Philadelphia, Pa.
Bush, Augustus,	Clark,	April 15,	Christ, Lonsdale, R. I.
Byllesby, Faber,	Potter, A.	May 27,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Conrad, Thomas K.	Potter, A.	May 24,	St. Philip's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Campbell, Wm. Thomas,	Lee, H. W.	May 24,	Trinity, Muscatine, Iowa.
Dean, George W.	Potter, H.	March 8,	Trinity, New York City.
Derby, Charles A.	Cobbs,	April 28,	Holy Cross, Uniontown, Ala.
Girault, John Francis,	Polk,	May 10,	St. Paul's, New Orleans, La.
Hitecock, William A.	Williams,	June 7,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
Hitchings, Horace B.	Williams,	June 7,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
Mason, Arthur,	Williams,	June 7,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
Mines, John F.	Williams,	June 7,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
Matlack, Robert S.	Potter, A.	May 24,	St. Philip's, Philadelphia, Pa.
McGuffee, Calvin,	Green,	April 26,	Grace, Canton, Miss.
Newbold, Wm. Allibone,	Lee, A.	April 12,	St. Andrew's, Wilmington, Del.
Noakes, Benjamin T.	Mellvaine,	April 23,	St. Timothy, Massillon, Ohio.
Perry, Wm. Stevens,	Eastburn,	March 29,	Grace, Newton, Mass.
Potter, Henry C.	Potter, A.	May 27,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Sams, Barnwell B.	Davis,	Feb. 12,	St. Helena Church, Beaufort, S.C.
Spalter, A. D.	Hopkins,	June 3,	St. Paul's, Burlington, Vt.
Stuart, Henry M.	Potter, A.	May 27,	St. Luke's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Williams, John R.	Williams,	June 7,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
Vallas, Anthony,	Polk,	May 21,	Trinity, New Orleans, La.

#### PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Bancroft, Lucius W.	Clark,	June 9,	Grace, Providence, R. I.
" Birdsall, Elias,	Upfold,	June 3,	Trinity, Fort Wayne, Ind.
" Bronson, B. S.	Atkinson.	May 31,	St. Luke's, Salisbury, N. C.
" Curran, T. P.	Mellvaine,	June 4,	St. James', Piqua, Ohio.
" Dalton, A.	Burgess,	June 11,	St. John's, Bangor, Maine.
" Davies, Thomas F.	Williams,	May 27,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
" Dewey, John S.	Williams,	April 12,	St. Thomas', New Haven, Ct.
" Eppes, William E.	Rutledge,	April 24,	Trinity, St. Augustine, Fla.
" Grover, James L.	Mellvaine,	March 16,	Urbana, Ohio.
" Hamilton, M.	Mellvaine,	June 4,	St. James', Piqua, Ohio.
" Hilliard, Francis W.	Atkinson,	March 25,	Pettigrew's Chapel, N. C.
" Howard, Roger S.	Burgess,	June 11,	St. John's, Bangor, Maine.
" Hutchinson, Daniel F.	Lee, H. W.	March 29,	Christ, Burlington, Iowa.
" Jeffries, P. N.	Mellvaine,	June 4,	St. James', Piqua, Ohio.
" Jope, Robert,	Johns,	March 13,	Grace, Portsmouth, Va.
" Kellogg, Charles T.	Williams,	May 27,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
" Leffingwell, C. S.	Williams,	May 27,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
" Maxcy, E. W.	Clark,	June 4,	St. Mark's, Warren, R. I.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Morrelle, Daniel,	Atkinson,	May 31,	St. Luke's, Salisbury, N. C.
" Murphy, William,	Atkinson,	May 31,	St. Luke's, Salisbury, N. C.
" Peck, John M.	Williams,	May 27,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
" Roberts, W. H.	Mellvaine,	June 4,	St. James', Piqua, Ohio.
" Townsend, John	Williams,	May 27,	Christ, Middletown, Conn.
" Wetmore, G. B.	Atkinson,	May 31,	St. Luke's, Salisbury, N. C.
" Wood, H. G.	DeLancey,	June 7,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.

## CONSECRATIONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Ascension Chapel,	Potter, H.	May 19,	Greenpoint, N. Y.
Calvary,	Whitehouse,	May 6,	Batavia, Ill.
Church of the Holy Apostles,	Davis,	March 11,	Barnwell, S. C.
Church of the Redeemer,	Davis,	March 14,	Orangeburg, S. C.
Grace,	Whittingham,	April 23,	Elk Ridge Landing, Md.
Grace,	Doane,	May 18,	Madison, New Jersey.
Grace,	Lee, H. W.	May 21,	Lyons, Iowa.
Pettigrew's Chapel,	Atkinson,	March 25,	Washington County, N. C.
St. Andrew's,	Smith,	April 15,	Louisville, Ky.
St. Andrew's,	Johns,	April 29,	Surry, Va.
St. John's,	Potter, A.	April 25,	Lawrenceville, Pa.
St. John's,	Green,	April 5,	Lake Washington, Miss.
St. Mark's,	Rutledge,	April 26,	Palatka, Florida.
St. Paul's,	Meade,	May 19,	Petersburg, Va.
St. Paul's,	Cobbs,	May 13,	Lowndesboro', Ala.
Trinity,	Johns,	April 8,	Staunton, Va.
Trinity Chapel,	Whittingham,	March 26,	Queen Caroline County, Md.

## OBITUARY.

DIED, in Salem, Massachusetts, April 4, JOHN WHITE TREADWELL, Esq., aged 72.

The death of Mr. Treadwell will be felt as a great personal loss, not only by a large circle of relatives and friends in the community in which he dwelt, but also by many others, especially among the Clergy of the Church, both in Massachusetts and in other parts of the country. For more than forty years he has been known as an active and devoted member of the Protestant Episcopal Church—firm, consistent and intelligent in his adherence to her doctrines and order. In his youth—like most of the members of our Church in New England—he was brought up as a Congregationalist, but having removed in early manhood to Salem, he soon connected himself with St. Peter's in that ancient town, took an active part in her affairs, and not long afterwards in those of the Diocese at large. As early as 1818, thirty-nine years ago, he was a member of its Standing Committee, and subsequently also in other years. The Church in Salem was one of the few churches established in New England before the Revolution. It was organized in 1733. Early in the present century it rapidly declined in numbers, and reached its lowest point of depression at about the period at which Mr. Treadwell removed to Salem. Its firm friends were then very few, and upon them the burden of its support was extremely heavy. But its greatest danger arose from the rapid progress and influence of Unitarianism at that date, to which three of the oldest Congregational parishes in the town, including the first ever formed on the shores of Massachusetts Bay, had yielded, and which thus gained a degree of strength in Salem, greater, relatively to population, than in any other place in the State. The influence of that system was felt in St. Peter's, and there were some in her congregation—prominent men in the community and indeed in the country—who were disposed to repeat the process once witnessed in King's Chapel, Boston, and substitute for her ancient standards of Faith and Worship, a Service Book of their own. Though sustaining intimate relations of social intercourse with some who sought this change, Mr. Treadwell remained steadfast in his maintenance of the Faith of the Church, and lived to see St. Peter's steadily advancing, until her communi-

cants, numbering only twenty-five when he joined the thinned rank of her members, had increased to more than two hundred and fifty, and her congregation had enlarged in like proportion. While the venerated Bishop Griswold was Rector of St. Peter's, the Rev. James C. Richmond being the assistant minister, it was determined that the old wooden church, which had stood a century, should be replaced by a substantial stone edifice, a work which was completed under the rectorship of the Rev. John A. Vaughan, D. D., through great sacrifice on his part, in addition to that of members of the parish. The effort at the time was a great one, and required large offerings from a few persons, among whom Mr. Treadwell was foremost. For this object, for the enlargement of the Church a few years later, and its improvement on various occasions, his contributions amounted to several thousand dollars, while at the same time his heart and hand were always ready for every work of charity. He was deeply interested in Church extension in the diocese and country, and in Christian Missions in foreign lands. He was "a cheerful giver," and a "good steward" of the bounties of God intrusted to him. He was eminently the friend of the clergy, and sought their society. They were his frequent guests. Several of our Bishops—some gone to their rest, others still laboring for Christ and His Church—and many of our Clergy have sojourned under his hospitable roof, and found there a Christian home. He was "given to hospitality," a true "lover of hospitality—a lover of good men," "not forgetful to entertain strangers." With an appreciation not usual among laymen, he entered into the duties and trials of the Sacred Ministry, and endeavored faithfully to hold up their hands by his cordial sympathy, counsel and aid. Until prevented by increasing infirmities he was an invariable attendant upon the usual services of the Church, and engaged in them in an earnest and devout manner. He was not accustomed to respond in whispers, but "out of the abundance of the heart" his mouth spoke. He had the fixed habit of worshiping in his own parish church, and was for many years a constant communicant. Familiar with the history, doctrines and distinctive principles of our Church, his attachment to her system strengthened with years.

In this brief sketch we designed to speak of Mr. Treadwell especially in his connection with the Church and Clergy, and, in closing it, shall merely refer to his life in other relations. He fulfilled important trusts in the community, and was held in high respect and honor. In early life he engaged with ardor in commercial enterprises, for which Salem was preëminently distinguished. But, at length, relinquishing these pursuits, he was connected, until near the close of his life, with one of the largest banking institutions in Salem, at first as its Cashier, afterwards for many years its President, the successor of the late Judge Story in that office. Associated also in its management with some of the ablest and most sagacious merchants of the country, he acquired extensive knowledge and great practical experience upon all points connected with the intricate subject of finance. He was among the first who advocated the importance of Savings Banks, and early took the lead in establishing one in Salem, which has been one of the largest in the country in the amount of its deposits, and his experience and gratuitous services as a director—extended through more than a quarter of a century—greatly promoted its signal success. Thus occupied by useful, honorable and beneficent duties, his years passed with few marked changes till he arrived at threescore. He could then look back over a life which had been crowned with a singular degree of prosperity. His home had been for several years unbroken by any afflictive change, and his days and years flowed on in the same uniform current of happiness. But soon there began a series of changes, such as have seldom fallen upon any household in so short a period. The messengers of death followed each other in rapid succession, and before he arrived at threescore and ten, a beloved wife, two daughters, his only surviving son, and two grandchildren, were all taken from this life. These afflictions were also followed by still other changes, involving extreme solicitude and great labor. Under this pressure of complicated trials, coming upon him when old age had begun, his vigorous constitution yielded,

and that disease ensued under which he labored until his release. But amidst all his troubles and afflictions, his hope was directed to his Saviour, and the "exceeding great and precious promises" made through Him, and this hope did not fail when the time of his departure drew near.

The solemn Service of the Church was said over his remains by two of the former pastors of St. Peter's—its present Rector being united to him by the close and tender ties of a near domestic relationship—in the Church where he delighted to worship, and at the grave, where, with those of other departed members of his family, they now repose. There they await the summons of Him who is "the Resurrection and the Life," through whose "mighty working," those corruptible bodies shall be changed and made like unto His glorious body, when, we humbly trust, this family, now so divided by death, shall be again forever united in that "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

DIED, at Urbana, Md., April 15th, the Rev. WILLIAM ARMSTRONG, Rector of Zion Parish, Frederick County.

Mr. Armstrong was in his 53th year, and had labored in the Ministry 38 years, having been ordained by Bishop Kemp, in 1819. His first parish was St. Matthew's, Wheeling, Va., succeeding his father, Rev. John Armstrong, who was the first Rector of the parish. After a faithful service of twenty-two years in Wheeling, he resigned his charge, on account of infirm health, and has since officiated in Frederick County, Md., where his character and labors gained him many friends. He died beloved and regretted by all who knew him.

The Vestry of his former parish at Wheeling, as also that of Zion Church, passed suitable resolutions of respect to his memory.

DIED, at Savannah, Georgia, on the 13th of March, the Rev. CALVIN COLTON, Professor of Public Economy in Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., aged 67 years.

Dr. Colton was born at Long Meadow, Mass., and graduated at Yale College in 1812. Reared and educated a thorough Congregationalist, he studied divinity at Andover, and was licensed to preach in 1815. He settled at Batavia, New York, where he remained till 1826, when his health became impaired and he went abroad. While in Europe he was for a time the correspondent of the N. Y. Observer. In these letters, afterwards published under the title of "Four Years in Great Britain," and which attracted great popular attention,—he treated with some severity the English Church and her dignitaries. Upon his return, however, to America, the changed condition of things in his own denomination, attracted his attention and it soon became known that he was entertaining doubts on the subject of non-episcopal ordination. These doubts were speedily solved by him, and he embraced Episcopacy, setting forth the reasons for the change in a work entitled, "The Religious Condition of the Country." Ordained by Bishop Onderdonk in 1835, he remained for a time in New York, engaged in pastoral duty, but his infirm health unfitted him for pulpit labors, and the residue of his life was mainly given to literary labors which he deemed of great importance, and for which he was conscious of being peculiarly competent. Among the works of a religious character written by him are, "Protestant Jesuitism" and "the Genius of the American Church." Besides editing for a time the *North American* of Philadelphia, he wrote several tracts upon political topics of the day, among which his "Junius" letters, written during the Harrison campaign, will long be remembered, for their force and point. These led to the production of a larger work upon *Political Economy*, which received high praise from those holding similar sentiments, upon important principles of national polity. The endowment of his Chair in Trinity College was designed as a token of respect to him as the author of this production. His pamphlet, "Abolition a Sedition," first attracted the attention of Henry Clay, and led to the intimacy which resulted in Dr. C's becoming the Biographer of that great Orator and Statesman. "*The Life and Correspondence of HENRY CLAY*," has engaged his attention for several years, and the sixth

and last volume was completed but a few days before his decease. Ten years after his marriage he lost his wife, and remained a widower until the close of his life.

Dr. Colton had sought in the mild climate of the South, and a suspension from literary labors, relief for his long impaired health. But neither change of climate, suspension of study, or the best medical skill, were of any avail, and six weeks after leaving his residence in New York, with the hope of benefit from the change, he was called hence. He was a man of no mediocre abilities, of studious habits and of very considerable attainments; and was remarkable for the kindness of his feelings and for the courtesy of his manners. In accordance with his request, made a few days before his death, his remains were brought to Long Meadow, the place of his nativity,—where they were interred, with appropriate funeral services, the Rev. Prof. Jackson, of Trinity College, officiating.

DIED, at Perth Amboy, New Jersey, April 6th, the Rev. JAMES CHAPMAN, Senior Presbyter of the Diocese of New Jersey, in the 72d year of his age.

Mr. Chapman was born at Elizabethtown, N. J., May 15, 1785. His early education was acquired at the academy of the late Dr. Barry, who was in his time so distinguished as a teacher, and to whom so many of the Bishops and elder clergy of the Church owe their early classical training. He subsequently entered and graduated with honor at Princeton College. His family were Presbyterians, but in early life he conformed to the Episcopal Church. He became a candidate for Holy Orders soon after leaving College. From his earliest youth he was distinguished for his correct morals and deportment, and became early impressed with the importance of a religious life. He enjoyed the privilege of pursuing his theological course under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Hobart, afterwards the distinguished Bishop of New York. A friendship thus commenced, terminated only with the life of that able and fearless champion of Primitive Truth and Apostolic Order. He was ordained Deacon in St. Paul's chapel, New York, on the 31st of May, 1807, by Bishop Benj. Moore; and was immediately after engaged as an assistant to the rector of Trinity Church, N. Y., and continued to be thus employed till the separation of Grace Church in 1809, forming many valuable and lasting friendships among the clergy and laity of the city. During this period he was invited, successively, to Trinity Church, New Haven, to Richmond, Va., and to St. Peter's, Perth Amboy. His fondness for rural life, and a strong local attachment to his native State and home, outweighing all other considerations, he accepted the latter, and entered upon the duties of this parish on September 9, 1809; was ordained Priest by Bishop Moore in Trinity Church, N. Y., on September 7, 1810; and instituted rector of St. Peter's Parish on August 8, 1811.

At this time the Diocese of New Jersey had no Bishop, and scarcely an existence. The deceased entered at once with zeal, on his chosen work; he found his own immediate parish in a very low state, small in numbers, and involved in debt. This debt was paid off, the number of pew-holders and communicants in a short time increased two-fold, the church edifice was repaired and beautified, a new parsonage house built, and the grounds laid out and ornamented, and the affairs of the parish brought into a prosperous condition.

In diocesan affairs he held a prominent place, and for a long series of years was one of the leaders in the diocese, was for twenty years a member of the Standing Committee, frequently a delegate to the General Convention, and was for more than twenty years the faithful Treasurer of "The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," a Society which had its origin in his own parish.

After laboring faithfully in his Master's service for more than thirty-five years, he resigned the rectorship of St. Peter's into younger hands, in 1842.

During the latter years of his life he officiated gratuitously as a missionary in Trinity Church, Woodbridge, an ancient but decayed parish, situated about five miles from his residence, oftentimes going and returning on foot. He thus continued working in God's service, until arrested by increasing years and infirmities. In the early part of 1856, he was attacked by a disease which resisted the



efforts of medicine, and gradually conducted him onward to the end of his pilgrimage. He bore all his afflictions—his nights and days of pain and anguish—with meek and humble submission to the Divine will.

The life of this venerable minister of Christ is full of instruction, as it was full of faithfulness and truth; marked by a beautiful simplicity of character; a straightforward, earnest, and entire devotion to duty; a faithful discharge of all the important trusts committed to his keeping. They who knew him best loved him most, and can best testify to his true performance of all the duties of pastoral and social life. His calm and serene death was a fitting close to such a life. Steadfast to the end, a bright example of Christian faith and humility, he has gone to his reward. "Well done, good and faithful servant," is the welcome of his Lord; and our response may well be, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his."

DIED at Painted Post, on the 11th of March, the Rev. JOHN D. GILBERT, aged 75 years.

The deceased was born in Connecticut, A. D. 1782. About thirty years ago, without ostentation, and upon conviction of duty, the result of long and prayerful study, he left the ministry of the Methodist denomination, in which he had long faithfully labored, and received at the hands of the Rt. Rev. John H. Hobart, Bishop of New York, authority to exercise the authority of Deacon in the Church of Christ, according to the rites and usages of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. He was in due course called to the Priesthood.

For twelve years he labored faithfully at Big Flats, Steuben County. Thence he was transferred to Palmyra, when, after two years of faithful ministry, he was in the inscrutable providence of Him who ordereth all things well, deprived of physical ability to continue his labors. Upon partial recovery, he essayed to renew his work in the Master's vineyard, but experiment convinced him of the vanity of the attempt. He soon retired to the village of Painted Post, where he continued to reside until his death.

DIED, at Sherwood, Lunenburg Co., Va., May 6th, the Rev. DAVID R. HENDERSON, a native of Glasgow, Scotland.

Mr. Henderson emigrated to this country about eight years since, and located in Pennsylvania. Soon after he began the study of divinity and entered the Presbyterian ministry, in which denomination he officiated for four years. An accidental association with members of the Episcopal Church, induced him to examine their mode of worship and the claims of the Church, when his views became altered, and he was soon after ordained by Bishop Potter.

For the past few months Mr. H. has had charge, temporarily, of Cumberland Parish, Va., where he labored with untiring zeal and devotion in his Master's service. The Scottish exile, far from kindred and home, now sleeps, we hope and believe, in peace, "no longer a stranger and foreigner, but a fellow-citizen with the saints and of the household of God."

#### AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY MOVEMENT.—OLD SCHOOL GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

It is too early yet to write the history of the American Bible Society in its late tampering with that Version of the Bible which it is its sole legitimate business to print and circulate. Strong efforts have been made, and are making, to silence the remonstrances of an outraged Christian sentiment, on the ground that the first blow was struck by a "High Churchman," as a "High Churchman," and for the purpose of detaching conservative men from the support of the Bible Society. Strange to say, two of our own Church papers have taken this ground. And yet, from all parts of the country, East and West, North and South, from the ablest scholars, and from nearly all Christian denominations, a voice has been heard, to which the American Bible Society will not turn a deaf ear, unless under the influence of a fatuity which amounts to madness. It must go back to the Old Version, and stick to it. For ourselves, we

shall feel repaid for many years of drudgery and toil, if, in sounding the first note of alarm on such a theme, we shall, in the end, fasten the mind and heart of a great nation to the sheet Anchor of our common hope. The Rev. A. C. Coxe, our Contributor, deserves all honor for the masterly skill and ability with which he has treated this delicate and grave subject.

We intend, by and by, to chronicle all the parties who shall have appeared, on the one side or the other, of this discussion. At present, and to show the current and strength of public opinion, we give the following:

In the Old School Presbyterian Assembly, at Lexington, Ky., on Wednesday, May 27, on motion of Rev. Dr. THORNWELL, the overture respecting the action of the American Bible Society with regard to the text of the Sacred Scriptures, was taken from the docket.

This overture set forth that the Society is the *printer*, not the *Editor*, of the Bible; its sole business is to circulate the common version of the English Scriptures, and that the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church be directed to prepare and publish an edition *for pulpit use* of the Holy Scriptures, conformed to the standard of the English text, to perpetuate the received version.

Rev. Dr. BRACKINRIDGE supported this overture in a very elaborate and eloquent speech, bearing with tremendous force upon the course of the Bible Society.

The matter was finally laid over to the next General Assembly.

#### NEW SCHOOL GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON SLAVERY.

At its late sessions at Cleveland, Ohio, this portion of the Presbyterians was convulsed by the introduction of Slavery memorials and speeches, until at length the Southern members seceded in a body. Thus the Presbyterian "Church" is again divided. The North and the South draw a strongly marked line of boundary, and henceforth there are three General Assemblies—three separate branches of the Presbyterian Church—three sets of doctrine—a trinity of discord.

#### TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY AT JAMESTOWN.

We are glad to see that the descendants of the Jamestown Colony are at last waking up to a consciousness of what is due to themselves and their ancestors. Plymouth Rock has so long been sung as the cradle of the American nation, that a great many people have come to believe it. Yet thirteen years before the landing of the Puritans from the "May Flower," a colony had been planted at Jamestown; and six years before, a vigorous settlement had been made by the Dutch at Manhattan. The Virginia element was a controlling one in the destinies of the country, and her sons do well to guard the honor of their native State. The late celebration was the *second* only that has ever been held. It was appointed for the 13th of May; and it was estimated that 7,000 persons, including sixteen military companies, participated. Ex-President Tyler occupied two and a half hours in his oration, and Gov. Wise spoke in response to the multitude. Fireworks and a grand ball terminated the ceremonies.

#### NORTH CAROLINA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY—DR. HAWKS' ADDRESS.

The people of Mecklenburg celebrated, on the 20th of May, the anniversary of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. The exercises commenced with a prayer by the Rev. D. Lacey, D. D. Gen. Young then introduced Hon. Mr. Osborne Reeder, who read the "Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence of the 20th of May, 1775." The President of the Day, Frederick Nash, Chief Justice of North Carolina, then introduced the Orator, Rev. F. L. Hawks, D. D., of New York. This distinguished divine, in an eloquent address of three hours and a half's duration, sustained the reputation he has won for talent and oratorical powers. The "Mecklenburg Declaration" was put forth more than a year before Congress declared for freedom; and the paper here promulgated, was undoubtedly the model on which Jefferson framed the Declaration of July 4, 1776.

## COLUMBIA COLLEGE, NEW YORK.

At a late meeting of the Trustees of this College, the following Professors were chosen, to enter upon their duties at the commencement of the next Academic year:—Professor Joy, Professor of Chemistry in Union College, to the Chair of Chemistry; Professor Davies, formerly of the U. S. Military Academy, West Point, to the Chair of Mathematics; and Professor Lieber, recently of Columbia College, South Carolina, to the Chair of History and Political Economy. There remains yet to be filled the Chair of Philosophy and Literature. These four are new Chairs—the two last separated from the Chair of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy, Evidences of Religion, Political Economy, Belles Lettres, &c. Of the other two, one from the Chair of Natural and Experimental Philosophy and Chemistry, the other from that of Astronomy and Mathematics. Other plans for enlarging the scope and perfecting the means of instruction in the College, are under consideration, and the whole will, it is believed, be matured to take effect with the beginning of the next Academic year, in the third week of September next. It is proposed to extend the collegiate course from four to six years; so that the graduates can reach a higher standard of scholarship than obtains at present among them. This movement, which cannot fail to be felt on the other Colleges of the country, is worthy of old Columbia. The addition to the corps of Professors of men known to be fitted for their posts, the extension of the Collegiate course from four to six years, are all in the right direction.

## OPENING OF DE VEAUX COLLEGE, AT NIAGARA FALLS.

The ceremony of opening De Veaux College, an institution founded and munificently endowed by the late Judge De Veaux, of Niagara Falls, took place on Wednesday, May 20th, in the new college edifice, just below Suspension Bridge. The morning service of the Church was said in the chapel, by the Rev. Mr. Fuller, of Canada West, assisted by the Rev. Mr. Stevens, of St. James' Church, Buffalo. An address was then delivered by Bishop De Lancey. The Rev. Dr. Gregory, President of the institution, followed in an inaugural address; after which, ex-Governor Hunt gave a sketch of the character of the founder of the College. The institution starts at once with thirty pupils, all orphans, who are to be educated, fed and clothed, free of charge. After the necessary improvements in and about the college shall have been completed, its privileges will be extended to sixty orphan children. The Trustees are Bishop De Lancey, Rev. Dr. Shelton, Rev. Mr. Clark, of Niagara Falls, ex-Governor Seymour, ex-Governor Hunt, Judge Ransom, of Lockport, Peter A. Porter, Esq., of Niagara Falls, Jacob A. Barker and Elijah Ford.

## SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

At the Diocesan Convention of Louisiana, which met May 7th, the Rt. Rev. Bishop Polk, in his Address, argued with great force in behalf of this proposed new University in Tennessee. Ten Southern Dioceses have responded in its favor. The address was received with profound attention. That part which referred to the University, was placed in the hands of a special committee, composed of the Rev. W. T. Leacock, D. D., the Rev. Charles Goodrich, D. D., the Rev. John Woart, Hon. Judge Guion, Dr. Wm. Newton Mercer, ex-Governor Henry Johnson, and John L. Lobdell, Esq., who made an elaborate and able Report, which concludes as follows:

In view of the foregoing considerations, the committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, First, That this Convention express its cordial approbation of the proposed movement for the establishment of a Southern University.

Second, That in compliance with the suggestion in the address of the Bishops of the Southern and Southwestern Dioceses, we do now elect one clergyman and

two laymen to represent this diocese in the Board of Trustees, to meet for organization at Chattanooga, on the 4th of July next.

WM. T. LEACOCK, *Chairman.*

Upon the reading of this report, several enthusiastic speeches were made by gentlemen from different portions of the State, and the resolutions were unanimously adopted. A ballot was then taken for the three Trustees, and the following gentlemen were elected: Rev. Dr. Leacock, Dr. Wm. Newton Mercer, and the Hon. Geo. S. Guion.

## SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

### DEATH OF BISHOP SKINNER, OF SCOTLAND.

The Rt Rev. WILLIAM SKINNER, D. D., Primus, and Bishop of Aberdeen, died in that city, on Wednesday, April 15th, after only twenty-four hours' illness. The deceased prelate, who was born at Aberdeen in 1778, was educated at Wadham College, Oxford. He received deacon's orders from the hands of Bishop Horsley of St. Asaph's, by whom, in 1802, he was ordained a priest. In the same year he began to officiate as curate to his father in St. Andrew's Church, Aberdeen, was consecrated Bishop of Aberdeen in 1816, took his degree of doctor of divinity at Oxford, in 1812, and in 1841 was elected Primus of the Church in Scotland. By American Churchmen, especially, the name of Bishop Skinner deserves to be held in grateful remembrance. For it was Bishop John Skinner, the father of the prelate just deceased, who, with two other Scottish Bishops, in an upper chamber of a mean dwelling-house, in a dirty lane of Aberdeen, consecrated the first Bishop for the United States, in 1784. The name of Bishop Skinner, indeed, may be said to form a bond of reunion between the English, Scottish, and American Churches; for the consecration of the first American Bishop by the Scottish Bishops is said to have been the means of attracting the serious attention of the English Church to the intolerant laws under which the Scottish Episcopate was languishing, and thus preparing the way for their repeal in 1792. The name, however, dates another generation back in the annals of the Scottish Church. The father of the first Bishop Skinner was the Rev. John Skinner, minister of the Episcopal Chapel at Langside, near Peterhead, author of an "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," &c. The good old priest of Langside, who had seen the disabilities imposed on the "Episcopalians" in 1746, and had so grievously suffered under them, lived to see them abolished, and died in 1807, at the great age of 86. His son, Bishop John Skinner, survived to the year 1816, when he died in his 73d year, after an illness equally brief, and of the same disease which has now cut off his son and successor in the episcopal office, at the age of 79.

### RESIGNATION OF THE BISHOP OF NORWICH.

The Rt. Rev. SAMUEL HINDS, D. D., Bishop of Norwich, A. D. 1849, has resigned the jurisdiction of his Diocese. Though there is no legal recognition of the vacancy of the Diocese, the Primate has certified to a vacancy *de facto*, and Parliamentary action is uncalled for, unless a retiring allowance is asked, which is not likely, as there is no available surplus from the revenues of the See. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners will probably grant a pension from the

common Fund. His administration, it is said, has proved a failure. He belongs to the Arnold and Whately theological school.

#### NEW BISHOP OF NORWICH.

The Hon and Rev. J. T. PELHAM, M. A., a younger brother of the Earl of Chichester, has received from Lord Palmerston the appointment to the Bishopric of Norwich, which recently became vacant by the resignation of the Right Rev. Dr. Samuel Hinds. The Rev. Gentleman, having served several minor offices in the Church, was presented by the Earl of Abergavenny, in 1837, to the rectory of Burgh Apton, in the diocese over which he is now about to preside, and this benefice he held until 1852, when he resigned it on accepting the incumbency of Christ Church, Hampstead. On the death of the Rev. Dr. Spry, in 1854, Mr. Pelham was presented to the valuable metropolitan rectory of St. Marylebone, which he held up to the present time. The Rev. Prelate, like all the Bishops who have been appointed by the present Government, is a strong adherent of the Evangelical party.

The diocese of Norwich includes the county of Norfolk, with part of Suffolk, and comprises more clergymen and cures of souls than any other in England.

#### CONVOCATION.—PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

The Convocation of this Province assembled at St. Paul's Cathedral, May 1, at 11 o'clock. The number of members summoned to the Lower House are—25 Deans, 1 Provost, (Eton College) 56 Archdeacons, 26 Capitular Proctors, and 42 Diocesan Proctors. The Bishop of St. David's was summoned as Dean of Brecon College. The Prelates, Deans, Archdeacons, and other dignitaries, appeared in the robes of their respective orders, and the Clergy in their gowns. The usual religious services were held at the opening, when the Litany was intoned in Latin by the Bishop of Lincoln; and the Latin sermon was preached by the Rev. Hayward Cox, Prebendary of Hereford and examining chaplain to the Bishop of that Diocese. The subject of his discourse was controversy and the principles that should govern it on religious questions, with a special application to Convocation. At the close of his discourse, the preacher noticed some of the grave questions affecting the Established Church. Such are the religious and secular education of the people, the revision of the present version of the Bible and of Church services, measures of Christian and of civil liberty, the relations of Church and State, (expressing an opinion that the carrying out the idea of separation in its completeness would impair the rights of Dissenters no less than of Churchmen,) and the constitution of Convocation itself. As regards the latter question, he urged instant attention; dwelling forcibly on the position in which Convocation is at present placed. He reminded his hearers that at present they could do no more than deliberate—that they are without the power of enacting canons. He desired a nearer approximation to the representative character of our civil legislature in the constitution of their synod—impressing on them that unless the laity have a voice in the selection of those clergymen who might be sent as members to Convocation, they could not expect sympathy or deference on the part of the Christian public. But with this modification he could anticipate a bright future for the Church, in contrast to its history, when at the Revolution—the period of civil liberty bursting forth on the people—it was thought necessary to silence the ambitious tone and factiousness of Convocation itself. After the sermon, the prelates and clergy went in procession to the Chapter House, when the writ summoning Convocation was read. The Archbishop then directed the Lower House to choose a Prolocutor, and meet him in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster, on Friday the 8th.

On the 8th of May, Convocation again assembled, and continued in session two days; when it was again prorogued until Wednesday, May 20th. In the Upper House there were present the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of Winchester, the Bishop of Chichester, the Bishop of St. David's, the Bishop

of St. Asaph, the Bishop of Lichfield, the Bishop of Oxford, the Bishop of Llandaff, the Bishop of Salisbury, the Bishop of Lincoln, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and the Bishop of Bangor. In the Lower House there were in attendance between *seventy* and *eighty* members.

In the Upper House, the most important business was the adoption of an Address to the Queen, which was also adopted in the other House, and which we give in full; the reappointment of the Committee on Home and Foreign Missions; and the reception of some petitions on the use of the Burial Service in certain cases; and on the right of Curates to vote for Proctors for Convocation.

The Address to the Queen is as follows:

"We, your Majesty's faithful subjects, the Archbishop, Bishops, and Clergy of the province of Canterbury, in Convocation assembled, approach your Majesty with the assurance of our loyal and affectionate attachment to your Majesty's Throne and person.

"We feel it to be a ground of much thankfulness to Almighty God, that in offering this, our accustomed address, we are able to join with it our humble congratulations on the prosperity which it has pleased Him to continue to your Majesty and to your illustrious Consort—a prosperity which is happily shared by the country at large, as well in regard to its internal tranquillity and welfare, as to the restoration of peace among the European powers.

"Since the last occasion when we were permitted to address your Majesty, several subjects of much interest to the national Church have been brought under our consideration. Among these we humbly conceive that nothing calls more urgently for our attention than the best modes of extending the blessings of the Church to the increasing population, which has far outgrown the actual provision both of the numbers of the clergy, and of the funds available for their support.

"Whilst we deeply regret this Episcopal destitution, we thankfully acknowledge the measure of private liberality which has been directed towards the purposes of conveying the means of grace towards our population at home, and to those colonial possessions of your Majesty which are so widely extended, with the laws, the language, the liberties, and, as we trust, the religion of our native land.

"It is a gratifying reflection that through private munificence, with little assistance from public sources, your Majesty's reign has been signalized by the erection of new Sees in every quarter of the globe, from Africa to Zealand, from Victoria to Rupert's Land.

"In the promotion of public education, a question which intimately concerns us as ministers of religion, we thankfully acknowledge the liberal aid afforded us by public grants. The attention directed towards the instruction of the young is a marked feature of the present age; but there is constant reason to regret that the early removal of children from schools too often engages them prematurely in the active business of life, before they have received the full advantages of a sound education, and before they have been properly instructed in their duty towards God and man. It is difficult to suggest the remedy, but if it should please your Majesty, in addition to that general summons in your Majesty's writ, to treat of certain difficult and urgent affairs concerning your Majesty, the security and defense of the Church of England, and the peace and tranquillity and public good of your kingdom and your subjects of the same, to commit to our special deliberation this, or any other question affecting the interests of our holy religion, or the usefulness of the Church, we trust that we shall not be found unmindful of the solemn character of the functions we are called to discharge, and shall conduct our proceedings under the Divine blessing, and with the diligence which would become us in obeying your Majesty's command.

"Hitherto the shortness of time given to our consultation has in a great measure frustrated the advantages, which we humbly trust would result if further



opportunity were afforded for ascertaining the opinions of the clergy by discussion in Convocation.

"Meanwhile, we assure your Majesty that any difficulties which may impede our endeavors to convey the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as the ruling principle of life, to every parish and to every individual in the land, will rather serve to stimulate than to restrain our exertions. We have the encouragement of knowing that while we attempt to carry into effect this important purpose, we are promoting the earnest wish and prayer of your Majesty, whom God has appointed to be our Supreme governor on earth, and whom, we trust, He may long preserve to see the increase of temporal prosperity, and the growth of true religion throughout your Majesty's dominions."

In the Lower House, the Deans of Worcester, Norwich, and Canterbury; Archdeacon Grant, Harrison, Randall, Sinclair, Sanford; Dr. McCaul, Lord Compton, the Rev. Canon Wordsworth, Rev. J. Randolph, Rev. — Freer, Hon. and Rev. S. Best, Rev. F. Massingberd, Rev. A. Oxenden, Rev. F. Vincent, Rev. G. E. Gillett, and Chancellor Martin, were appointed as the committee of *gravamina et reformanda*; to whom numerous petitions were presented; and, among others, the following:

By the Dean of Norwich, for the next or some early session—

"That this house do take the earliest opportunity of considering the suggestions contained in the report of a joint committee of Convocation, presented in the session of the 20th July, 1854, with a view of inquiring whether, by some modification of her rules and services, the Church may not be enabled more adequately to administer to the spiritual necessities of the land."

By the Rev. F. Massingberd—

"That it appears to this house that the intention lately announced on the part of their lordships the Bishops, to allow the use of the Litany, in certain cases, as a separate service, is deserving of the gratitude of the Church; and that it is worthy of inquiry whether there are any other ways, within the existing law, by which a considerable part of the recommendations contained in the reports of the joint committee on Church services and the committee of this house on *gravamina et reformanda* might be carried out."

Also, a motion for an address—

"Humbly to represent to his Grace and their lordships, that it appears to this house to be a subject which might fitly occupy the attention of this Convocation, whether any and what steps might be taken towards the reunion of the divided members of Christ's body in our country, and whether it might not tend, under the Divine blessing, towards the accomplishment of an object so earnestly to be desired and so anxiously to be sought, if their lordships should be pleased to commend the subject, in some definite and formal way, to the prayers of the faithful members of the Church."

By the Rev. James Fendall—

"That this Lower House of Convocation present a petition to the Upper House, requesting his Grace the President and their lordships the Bishops to take into consideration the propriety of presenting an address to the Crown, praying that her Most Gracious Majesty may be pleased to grant her royal license and authority to the Convocations of the provinces of Canterbury and York, to enact and put in use a canon, prescribing what ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof shall henceforth be retained and be in use in this Church of England."

By the Archdeacon of Coventry—Renewal of a motion of the former Convocation in reference to Church hymnal.

The two subjects, which excited most interest in the discussions, were the following; the first introduced by Dean Milman, and amended by Archdeacon Grant—

"That a committee of this house be appointed to examine by what authority the separate services for November 5, January 30, and May 29, were drawn up and are appointed to be read, and the legal force which they severally possess; to report thereupon to this house; and to make such recommendations relating to those services as they shall think desirable." The resolution was adopted, and a committee appointed.

The Rev. Canon Wordsworth moved the following resolution, of which he had given notice on the previous day:—

"That a committee of this house be appointed to consider the best means of obtaining the counsel and coöperation of the laity of the Church, particularly at annual Visitations or diocesan Synods; and that the committee be desired to report to this house on the subject as soon as convenient; and also to frame the draft of a dutiful representation upon it from this house to his Grace the President and their lordships in the Upper House." This motion was carried by a large majority.

In the doings and debates of Convocation, we cannot fail to detect not only an improved tone and spirit, but the increasing moral power of this body. Even the Archbishop of Canterbury bears himself differently, and altogether encouragingly; and the manner in which he met the carping of the new Bishop of London must have been felt by the latter as a rebuke. The resolution of Canon Wordsworth on Diocesan Synods reaches cardinal principles; and this whole movement we hail as the brightest sign of the times since the Reformation. Parties are ignored in the attempt at revival of Convocation; and the most timid are growing hopeful and even confident.

We go to press at this stage of its proceedings.

#### NEW BISHOPRICS IN INDIA.

At a meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Feb. 20th, the Report of the Sub-committee on the extension of Episcopacy in India, which had been approved by the Standing Committee, was read. It was stated that a feeling very friendly to the object had been manifested in the Northwest Provinces, and that memorials signed by many hundred persons had been sent to the Society. One which had just arrived from Burmah was read to the Board. It was resolved that memorials should be sent to the Prime Minister, the President of the Board of Control, and the Directors of the East-India Company, with the object of obtaining the necessary Parliamentary authority for the erection of three new Sees, at Agra, Lahore, and Tinnevely. The following were requested to form a deputation to the Prime Minister and the President of the Board of Control:—The Archbishop of CANTEBURY, the Bishop of OXFORD, the Rev. A. R. Symonds, the Rev. F. Poynder, H. W. B. Frere, Esq., and C. W. Puller, Esq.

#### ANOTHER CHURCH SYNOD.—CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

The Bishop of Capetown has at length followed the example of his right reverend brethren in Australia, in assembling a Synod of his Diocese, comprising the laity represented by delegates. The objections, formerly supposed to exist, in the want of permission to call Synods, have been disposed of by the Royal assent to the Melbourne Church Bill, and by the Secretary of State's despatch of February 15th, 1856, to the Governor General of Canada. In respect to membership, the Melbourne Church Bill requires an express declaration of Church-membership, and disavowal of connection with every other religious body, from every voter, and rules that no one shall be accepted as a delegate who has not been a communicant for the whole year, at least immediately preceding the election; whereas the Bishop of Capetown was content that any one offering himself for a delegate should be simply a communicant, and that only those voters who were not communicants should be required to make a declaration of Church membership, the Melbourne code being thus somewhat the more stringent of the two. The objects of the Synod, with the limitations

of its functions, are all very clearly explained in a circular letter issued by the Bishop summoning the lay delegates. It is declared to be incompetent, as being only a Diocesan Synod, to touch the Book of Common Prayer, the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Homilies, Canons, &c.

The points on which its deliberations are invited are the following:—

1. The constitution of the Synod itself. 2. The steps to be taken to place the clergy of the diocese in the position of incumbents, instead of that of licensed curates. 3. The appointment, support, and discipline of the clergy. 4. The tenure and management of Church property. 5. Questions relating to the formation and constitution of parishes. 6. Difficulties which have presented themselves with regard to marriages, divorces, and sponsors. 7. The mission work of the diocese. 8. The subject of education. 9. The desirableness or otherwise of seeking to obtain the assistance of the Legislature to carry out the objects of the Synod. And other points of minor importance.

Five parishes out of nineteen refused to send lay-delegates; and three out of about thirty clergymen refused to attend.

The Synod was opened January 20th, with a most able and interesting charge from the Bishop.

The Bishop of Capetown, who is apparently a most efficient man, has been assailed by the dissenting press with great severity. He recently, in a correspondence with a Mr. Surtees, on Synodical action, has the following, on the present condition of the English Church: "Of Dr. Arnold none can speak without respect for his Christian courage and real goodness. But Dr. Arnold did not believe in the Divine constitution of the Church—he did not believe in a visible Church at all—he was the friend and ally in all religious matters of the Chevalier Bunsen. And he was not only the ally of this very able and good man, though tinged with Rationalism; but has become the founder of the Rationalistic school now struggling to obtain a footing in the English Church; and had he lived until now, would have been pained to behold the effects of his teaching, not only in the Church at large, but also in his own family—one of his sons having, after first becoming a skeptic, then a Methodist—and able to find rest nowhere—just joined the Church of Rome. Were the secret history known of those who have been perverted, it would be found, I believe, in a large number of cases, to be similar to that of Dr. Arnold's son. It would be found that they had not been trained up in the distinct principles and doctrines of the Church of England—that very many of them had been nurtured either as Nonconformists or in the extreme Calvinistic School of our Church. It was so at least with the most remarkable of those men who are now lost to us—with Manning, and Wilberforce, and Newman, and Pugin—and I might add, the Ryders, and Sargeants, and Simeons."

#### CHURCH AND STATE PARTIES IN ENGLAND.

The vote in the House of Commons, disagreeing with and non-sustaining the Palmerston Ministry in the Chinese War, led to a dissolution of Parliament and an appeal to the country, where a vote has just been taken. It is worthy of note that, in this election, a union of Liberals and Low Churchmen went for the Ministry; the latter sustaining him on the ground of his late appointments to the Episcopate. They talk plainly in England; and it is evident enough that the Church, which has lately been infused with new life, is to occupy a more important place in future political struggles. A complete and unexpected reorganization of parties, however, seems probable. Where the Church will come up in this boiling of the political caldron, is not yet determined. But in the election, the Ministry were large gainers, standing at least three hundred and sixty-five Government, to two hundred and forty-nine Opposition. Several leading Anti-Church members were routed, as Mr. Miall, Mr. Fox, Mr. Pellate and Sir William Clay; the radical Manchester party has suffered a total defeat, Cobden, Bright, and Gibson, being rejected; while several decided Churchmen are returned, as Mr. Gladstone, Mr. A. J. Beresford Hope, Sir W. Heathcote, and others.

STRANGE DEVELOPMENTS.—BISHOP TAIT, MR. STANLEY, AND MR. MAURICE.

We observe some movements of late in England which are worth reporting as signs of the times. It is known that in place of Professor Hussey, the Rev. A. P. Stanley has been appointed by Lord Palmerston, as Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, and also as examining chaplain to the Bishop of London. This same Prof. Stanley has lately published a course of Lectures, in one of which, besides loose statements, unguarded and undefined opinions, there occurs the following passage: "If the Christian religion be a matter not of mint, anise, and cummin, but of justice, mercy, and truth; if the Christian Church be not a priestly caste, or a monastic order, or a little nest or a handful of opinions, but the whole congregation of faithful men dispersed throughout the world; if the ancient maxim be correct, *Ubi tres laici ibi est ecclesia*, then the range of the Church is as wide as the range of the world, which it was designed to penetrate, as the whole body which its name includes."—p. 12.

Now, so far is this "maxim," from having the support of Catholic antiquity, as Mr. Stanley intimates, it was the saying of Tertullian after he became a *Montanist*. More ancient are the words of St. Ignatius, *χωρίς τούτων* (Bishops, priests, and deacons) *ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται*.

Here are further extracts from Mr. Stanley: "Can we hesitate to say, that if the Christian Church be drawing to its end, or if it continue to its end with no other objects than those which it has hitherto sought, it will end with its acknowledged resources confessedly undeveloped, its finest hopes of usefulness almost untried and unattempted." \* \* \*

"It may be that the age for creating new forms of the Christian faith is past and gone—that no new ecclesiastical boundaries will henceforth be laid down among men. It is certain that in the use of the old forms is our best chance for the present. Use them to the utmost—use them threadbare if you will; long experience, the course of their history, their age and dignity, have made them far more elastic, far more available than any we can invent for ourselves. But do not give up the study of the history of the Church either in disgust at what has been, or in despair of what may be. The history of the Christian Church, no less than of the Jewish, bears witness to its own incompleteness."

Now, in the name of all that is orthodox, what does such language mean? We suppose that we know very well what it does mean; and so do our readers.

In the same vein, Bishop Tait amused himself recently in the House of Lords with the following bit of flippant ignorance: He said, "As for the testimony of the Fathers of the Church, there was no subject on which a whole string of Fathers could not be brought on one side, and a whole string on the other." Will the Bishop be kind enough to furnish a catena of the Fathers who deny the doctrine of the TRINITY? or of the essential DIVINITY of JESUS CHRIST? The speech is only noticeable as showing the tone and spirit of the new Bishop of London.

Nor is this all. The English papers have the following: "It will be remembered that, in 1855, the Rev. F. D. Maurice was obliged to resign his Professorship at King's College, London, in consequence of a difference of opinion between the Council of that Institution and himself regarding the propriety of certain doctrines of his on eternal punishment. Since the appointment of Dr. Tait to the See of London, and of Mr. Stanley to an examining chaplaincy to that Prelate, great efforts have been made to procure Mr. Maurice's reinstatement in the professorship. We are enabled to state that through the interference of Bishop Tait, the visitor of the College, and of the new Dean of Westminster, (Dr. Trench,) this result is very probable. The Rev. Gentleman has lately given £500 to the Working Men's College, and £1000 more have been lent to it on a mortgage, by an unknown person, who is said to be Mrs. F. D. Maurice."

We see indications multiplying that the "Broad School," in England, are becoming as radical in their Church, as in their doctrinal notions; as pretentious, as they are insolent, and as intolerant and bitter as they are loose and radical.